

THE

ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR APRIL, 1843.

- Art. I. 1. *Inaugural Lecture on Modern History, with Appendix.*
By Thomas Arnold, D.D. Delivered at Oxford, December 1841.
2. *Preface to the Third Volume of Thucydides.* By the same.

SEVERAL of our contemporaries have already been employed in paying the tribute of admiration and regret so richly due to the lamented author of these and other works; and while our hearts deeply sympathize with that which has been already poured forth, we feel that we might do him an injustice in attempting to appreciate his merit, socially, intellectually, or spiritually. It is not our intention to swell the echo of the dirge which has been drawn forth by genuine feeling, and by the sorrows 'in which the stranger intermeddleth not.' Let it suffice to indicate that we do not undervalue him; and that if we are about to canvass freely, to oppose, and, as far as we are able, to refute, his sentiments on one important point, it is precisely because we so esteem his judgment upon others. Arguments such as we are about to adduce, assume consequence in our eyes, solely because they are deliberately advanced by Dr. Arnold, and dutifully received by many of his admirers.

The subject which we have to discuss is not at all strange to these pages; but the views to which we now find our own in contrast, *are* rather strange, in modern days at least; so that the argument becomes less hackneyed. Dr. Arnold's sentiments concerning the relations of State and Church, at first strike some persons as so extraordinary, that they find it difficult to believe him sincere. We have known those who imagined that he held them as a kind of shift, to enable him to stand his ground within the pale of the establishment, and to give him *something* to say, where nothing good could be said. On the contrary, there are

numerous proofs that he was an ardent admirer of his own theory. He cannot avoid going out of his way, even in his notes to Thucydides, besides the more formal statement in his preface, to inculcate what he deems so important truth. In his 'Inaugural Lecture on Modern History,' where no one could have expected such a thing, he devotes several pages to the topic; and not satisfied with this, has annexed an appendix of thirty-three pages to fortify his position against Mr. Gladstone, the Archbishop of Dublin, and Mr. Gladstone's Edinburgh Reviewer.

Dr. Arnold entitles his own views, *The Moral Theory of a State*. By giving it this name, he gains for his argument an apparent advantage, and betrays, we think, a misapprehension of those who, like ourselves, would oppose him. Of this we shall afterwards speak more at length. On the ground that the State is, or ought to be, a moral power, he claims for it a right to legislate on religious matters, and to punish wickedness *as such*; to become the spiritual educator of the nation; to establish and endow religious teachers, and to eject men from political or even social privileges, because of a want of conformity to the State religion. He alleges that these high powers may be, and often are, used tyrannically; but he will not allow that to use them *at all* is overstepping the rights of sovereignty. How to reconcile the just freedom of individuals with those rights, he declares to be a question than which he 'knows none more difficult,' (p. 55, Lectures;) but he maintains that it exists equally in the system of his opponents. To *persecution* his whole nature and his uniform conduct were as adverse as some of his principles appear favourable; and if such deductions are made from them by us, they would undoubtedly have been disowned by him. In his view, community of religion is an essential element of nationality; and a dissenter from the national religion is a sort of foreigner in the country. Dr. Arnold would have him treated with all the kindness which aliens ought to receive, but regards a claim of admission to equal rights in the State as quite preposterous. He teaches that the State may, with equal justice, adopt the 'New Testament as its law, or the institutes and code of Justinian.'—(p. 53.) Finally, he does not shrink to declare that the State is the perfect Church.

'When I speak then of a State requiring obedience to the Christian law, it means that the State, *being the perfect Church*,* should do the Church's work; that is, that it should provide for the Christian education of the young, and the Christian instruction of the old; that it should, by public worship and by a *Christian discipline*, endeavour, as

* Here, as elsewhere, the italics, or capitals, in the passages quoted, are our own.

much as may be, *to realize Christianity to all its people*. Under such a system, the teachers would speak because they believed, (for Christian teachers, as a general rule, do so,) and their hearers would, in like manner, learn to believe also, &c. &c.'—p. 61, Lectures.

This is but one passage out of many, which, taken by itself, might send a reader away with no other feeling than that of wonder at the author's singular extravagance. We must, however, add, that he does not pretend that his theory can be at present realized ; he is merely describing his own *beau ideal* of a State, and tries to point out the direction in which we ought to strive. Instead of desecrating the functions of the State by alleging that religion is beyond its sphere, he desires to sanctify the hearts and persons of statesmen, and make their measures pure, righteous, and Christian ; and if they are not so yet, he would reply—Neither (alas !) are ecclesiastics much better ; but that it is no reason for desecrating the church.

'If men run away with the mistaken notion that liberty of conscience is threatened only by a *State* religion, and not at all by a *Church* religion, the danger is that they will abandon religion altogether to what they call the Church; that is, *to the power of a society far worse governed than most States*, and likely to lay far heavier burdens on individual conscience, *because the spirit dominant in it is narrower and more intolerant*.'—p. 59.

This seems to give a little more insight into his views. He is acted upon not solely by love for the power of the State in religious matters, but perhaps quite as forcibly by dread of 'what they call the Church.' In truth there is something here which dissenters often overlook ; and yet the present state of the Wesleyan body might sufficiently admonish them of it. Undesirable in the abstract—and in our firm belief wholly unchristian—as is the exercise of any religious compulsion by the State, it is not an uncompensated evil ; nor is it certain that a sudden and entire renunciation of all control over religion on the part of the State, would not exceedingly increase the power of social persecution in the hands of the (so-called) Church, unless the minds of its adherents were first emancipated. This we throw out for consideration, and return to Dr. Arnold. Let us hear his fundamental principles on the subject of national authority.

'Turning then to regard the inner life of a nation, we cannot but see that here, as in the life of an individual, it is determined *by the nature of its ultimate end*. What is a nation's main object, is therefore a question which must be asked, before we can answer whether its inner life (and consequently its outward life also, which depends upon the inner life) is to be called good or evil. Now it does not seem easy to

conceive, that a nation can have any other object than that which is the highest object of every individual in it. If it can, then the attribute of sovereignty which is inseparable from nationality becomes the dominion of an evil principle. For suppose, for instance, that a nation, as such, is not cognizant of the notions of justice and humanity, BUT that its highest object is wealth, or dominion, or security. It then follows that the sovereign power in human life, which can influence and compel the actions of us all, is a power altogether unmoral, and yet commanding the actions of moral beings; then, evil. Again, if, BEING cognizant of the notions of justice and humanity, IT DELIBERATELY PREFERS *other objects* to them, then here is the dominion of an evil principle still more clearly. But if it be cognizant of them, and appreciates them rightly, then it must see that they are more to be followed than any objects of outward advantage; then it acknowledges moral ends as a higher good than physical ends; and thus, as we said, agrees with every good individual man in its estimate of the highest object of national no less than of individual life.'—pp. 12, 13, Lectures.

Perhaps no other passage can be found which so concisely and fully sets forth the argumentative basis on which Dr. Arnold deliberately placed his doctrine; nevertheless, we doubt whether it ought to be looked on as really his main argument. It certainly appears to us exceedingly fallacious, and void even of plausibility.

We object, in the outset, to all *à priori* speculations of this nature, worthy more of a mystical dreamer like Plato, than of an historical inquirer like Dr. Arnold. If any one wishes to learn the *ultimate object* of any of the great phenomena of history, he must analyze the progress of events, and so seek for the solution; and not settle the question by an abstract syllogism, as here. But we, moreover, complain that the passage quoted derives a sophistical help from the use of ambiguous terms. First, the phrase *ultimate end*, or *object*, is capable of so many meanings, that we are quite perplexed to follow the reasoning. Even in far simpler questions it involves extreme uncertainty. If asked, what was the ultimate end or object of a *ship*, one person would reply, to carry goods and passengers over the sea; another, to keep up intercourse between different nations; a third, to diffuse the blessings of civilization and religion; a fourth, the glory of God. Again, if the 'end' of the matrimonial relation were discussed, it might be urged that the physical and social uses of it are quite secondary, and that its highest and true object is, the spiritual benefit of the married parties; and hence it might be inferred that a husband's primary and essential duty is, to instruct his wife in spiritual things, and that he ought to exact of her a submission to his religious ordinances. Undoubtedly, *all* the relations of human life may be consecrated by us,

so far as they are lawful ; and ought to be so : but we are involved in endless absurdity, if we insist that what may be called in some sense the *ultimate* end, is the end by which the nature of the relationship is determined and its duties ascertained. The religious mind cannot deny that the glory of God is the true *ultimate end* of every human thing ; and of course, it is likewise the end of national existence. Dr. Arnold, as it were, shames us into a confession that the ‘highest object’ of a nation must be something of religious and moral value ; and proceeds to infer that a nation ought to endow churches, to exclude dissenters, &c. He might equally infer the same of every shipowner, and every community soever. Again, the word *nation* is also ambiguous. By the phrase ‘object of a nation,’ he seems to mean ‘object of *national existence*,’—i. e., the design of *God* in allowing nations to exist. Yet presently he uses it to mean *national government*, which is wholly a different thing. If it be said that he meant this all along, we complain of an unfair advantage gained by the phraseology ; for there would be nothing plausible in assuming that the end of *worldly government* is spiritual goodness ; whereas by putting the word *nation* in the place of the other expression, he probably wins the assent of many. A similar advantage is gained by the use of the term ‘inner life’ for the public administration, laws, and institutions, which are really nothing but an *outer* life. In contrast to the foreign affairs of a nation, its home affairs may certainly be called *inner* ; but in this connexion the sound of the word imposes on the unwary reader, as if, whatever is *inner*, (for instance, an Act of Parliament !) were therefore spiritual. It appears to us, moreover, a great mistake, to speak of the public acts of statesmen as ‘*the* national life.’ What is vaguely called the ‘government,’ even in the freest states, is only *one* particular outward manifestation of national life ; and, in fact, the great mass of nearly every nation takes no part in it whatever. We further demur to his statement, that sovereignty has anything to do with nationality. In proof of the contrary, we appeal to the case of India, where we see the British to be sovereign, not because they have any nationality or ‘inner life’ in common with the Hindoos, but because physical force is in their hand. While that is the case, no one else is able to repress injustice and maintain peace ; but they *are* able. This fact constitutes in them a duty to use their power for good, and while they so use it, it becomes a duty in the subjects to obey. Such is at least our view of the case ; and, we suspect, Dr. Arnold’s too. Now it is contrary to all fact, that the organ in which the maximum physical force resides, concentrates in itself the highest and inner life of the nation ; why then ascribe to it the duties of a spiritual body ?

Dr. Arnold endeavours to evade the objection, that his argu-

ment would apply equally to all other associations, by laying stress on the fact, that the State is the only one which possesses 'sovereignty,' and can 'influence and compel the actions of us all;' and, *therefore*, we should establish the dominion of an evil principle, in conceding that the State is an 'unmoral' institution. If this is to the purpose, it assumes the very point which is denied. By 'unmoral,' Dr. Arnold of course here means 'non-spiritual'; (for *we* also hold the State and every other human association whatever, to be *moral*,) and he rightly infers that it cannot be a non-spiritual institution, if it is to be justified in 'compelling' us as to spiritual matters. We, however, are so far from admitting this, as to maintain that such compulsion is not a function of the State at all, but is a violent and wrongful usurpation. True: but the State (perhaps he means) has the power of compulsion, and, therefore, surely must have the right! We deny the inference, and we do not wholly grant the fact. That it has not the power of compelling *belief*, is certain; and is acknowledged by Dr. Arnold: and its power of compelling *obedience*, is limited. The Roman emperors were not able to compel Christians to cast incense on the altar of Jupiter; Philip of Spain could not force his Dutch subjects to worship the Host. On the other hand, it daily happens that our lives are at the mercy of other men, as much as they are at the mercy of a king, or of a parliament; but the fact of their being *able* to kill us, (if this is what is meant by 'compelling us to religious duties,') does not constitute them guides of our religious actions, or educators of our children.

When he uses the wide phrase '*influence* or *compel*', he reminds us that there are thousands of persons more under the influence of the Bank of England and the Birmingham railroad, than of the Queen's cabinet; but this does not constitute a spiritual relationship. Indeed, he afterwards lays stress on the compulsory power exercised by excommunication, in proof that *other* organizations, besides that called the State, may tempt men to hypocrisy by punishing their want of orthodoxy. This is true; but it proves too much. Since a bank or a post-office may deprive a man of his bread, by arbitrarily discharging him for heterodoxy, *therefore* the relation between the parties is a spiritual one; *therefore*, those in power are justified in choosing a religion for the inferior; and *therefore*, his ejection, however harsh, is not an overstepping of their proper functions!

Further: let us suppose, for argument's sake, a state of things, in which the supreme government should be of pure and angelic perfection; but in which, at the same time, every subordinate society should be wholly corrupt; every company of bankers, of merchants, of shipowners, every society for insurance, every petty meeting, and every partnership of trade, void of faith,

honour, justice, mercy. We ask, whether to live in such a nation would be bearable to any good man, and whether the goodness of the central '*moral*' union could make up for the badness of the local and secondary '*unmoral*' ones. It is evident that it would not; and that to make human life worth having, there must be morality in the smaller societies, as well as in the greater one; in those to which we do not concede the power of life and death, as much as in that to which we do concede it. How then can the last-named point of difference between them reconcile Dr. Arnold to the idea, that a banking company may, without reprehension, and without evil consequences, be *unmoral*, but that a State must not and cannot be? What guarantee, moreover, does he think that we get for the good behaviour of governors, by laying down that government is to be moral *in some other sense* than that in which *all* societies are to be moral? It seems to us, that the sentiment, if believed, paves the ready road towards the '*dominion of an evil principle*', for it destroys all test of morality.

We must proceed to call attention to the words which we have placed in small capitals. He makes two suppositions, which, he seems to think, exhaust the alternatives which may be held against him. First, that a nation (as such) is not cognizant at all of justice and humanity; secondly, that being cognizant of them, it is yet deliberately (and therefore wickedly) to prefer other objects to them! We are really amazed at so extravagant and gratuitous a misrepresentation. By way of illustration, let us consider the case of a ship company, as that of the owners of the Great Western, who combined to build and store the vessel, and send her, duly fitted out, on a mercantile enterprise from Bristol to New York. Their avowed immediate and sufficient object is, pecuniary gain; and, therefore, in Dr. Arnold's view, it is an *unmoral society*, and is not bound to unite in common worship, or to refuse Jew and Parsee shareholders; while, as it does not possess the power of religious compulsion, (i. e. the right over life and death,) it can be thus *unmoral*, without becoming *immoral*. Now, is it nevertheless true that this company is '*not cognizant at all of JUSTICE?*' So far otherwise, that all hope of permanent *gain* on the part of the company, as all hope of *security* to a nation, is obviously and avowedly based upon the strict observance of justice. But let us pass to *MERCY*. We suppose the Great Western to fall in with a ship on fire, and to deviate from her course to save the unfortunate persons exposed to so terrible a calamity. No man of common sense will infer that the Great Western Company was established for the purposes of mercy, and that this, not money, is, in fact, '*its real and highest end.*' Men, though knit into associations, do not the less carry

within them human hearts and souls. The Great Western saves the men from the burning ship, not because mercy is the 'object' of the Company, as such, but because her captain and sailors retain the feelings of humanity; and the shareholders at home, knowing that nothing but a ship at hand can succour a ship on fire, for the very same reason justify the captain, though it may have involved the uncompensated expense of several days' steaming. On the other hand, to occupy the vessel in assisting any spiritual object, however excellent, (suppose the planting of a missionary colony,) to the pecuniary loss of the shareholders, would be wholly unjustifiable; unless their previous and unanimous consent had been obtained, or unless the consenting majority indemnified the dissenting minority.

Now every word of this will apply equally to States, so as to exculpate our views from Dr. Arnold's reprehension and misapprehension. First, we do not hold a State to have nothing to do with justice, but everything; and that, (not *although*, but) *because* we maintain that its primary and sufficient object is security. We, moreover, fearlessly affirm, that no party and no individuals in England have so boldly upheld the duty of the State, to act on principles of justice, as those who teach that security is the proper and adequate end of government. Whether among churchmen or among dissenters, as a general rule, the very same persons who have been in favour of the voluntary system, in regard to national religion, have also protested, on the ground of justice, against slavery, against wanton wars, and against class-legislation. If we wish to find men who maintain, that for the sake of imagined expediency a government may violate the common laws of justice, we must look chiefly to the ranks of those who, like Sir Robert Inglis, impose taxes on men of different religion from themselves, while declaring that it would be against their own conscience to pay similar ones in turn. One more quotation on this subject we must produce:—

'It is allowed by those who object to the moral theory of a State, that Christian legislators did well in forcibly suppressing gladiatorial shows and impure rites, 'as being immoral and pernicious actions'; but if the legislator has anything to do with morality, the whole question is conceded; for morality is surely not another name for expediency, or what is advantageous for body and goods; yet if it be not, and a legislator may prohibit any practice because it is wicked, then he regards moral ends, and his care is directed towards man's highest happiness, and to the putting down his greatest misery, moral evil, &c.'

—p. 69, Lectures.

There is here a strange inability to see distinctions that are to most common and practical men very obvious, and a greedi-

ness of seizing on a supposed concession, which astonishes us in such a mind. It is avowed by his opponents that the State does well to suppress ‘immoral and *pernicious* actions,’ which Dr. Arnold interprets as if it had been said, ‘immoral actions, *as such*, and even if they be not *pernicious* to the body and goods of others beside the immediate agent.’ He moreover appropriates to his views the title, ‘The *moral* theory of a State,’ to which name we feel that our own doctrine has a far greater right, except that we do not allow it to be a *theory* at all: but on this we shall presently dilate. Let us once more recur to the Great Western. We are at liberty to suppose that one of the directors had been found to be a confirmed drunkard, and that the Company, in disgust and dread of this ‘immoral and pernicious’ habit, had removed him from his office. Might we not justify his removal without allowing Dr. Arnold’s inference, that the end of the Great Western was ‘man’s highest happiness, and the putting down of his greatest misery, moral evil?’

It is to us incredible that Dr. Arnold could mean to say that all wickedness is to be punished by law. No machinery could be invented to reach a hundredth part of the notorious sin that exists in the purest nation in the world; and a line must be drawn somewhere. We do not admit that sin is ever to be punished *because* it deserves God’s judgment in a future world, but only because it is injurious to the welfare of the community in this world. If it cannot be proved to demoralize others, and so to make them worse citizens, or to incapacitate the individual himself for his duties as a citizen, then let the deed, however sinful, pass without notice by the law. If it be a disgusting and loathsome one, let it be punished socially by the stigma of public opinion: should, however, the tone of social morals be too low for this, then it is probable that no law would really be executed. We are not therefore frightened by his inference, that, according to this, certain abominations ought not to be counted criminal, although we are by no means of opinion that the inference is just.

The practical legislator has two main questions to consider: first, what enactments are intrinsically good as national and compulsory measures; next, whether the moral state of the nation is such as to make it possible to execute them. An English parliament certainly ought not to allow an Indian prince to open in Middlesex or Surrey what might be called a Hindoo Temple, but would be a brothel. The civil power would rightly suppress it, because of its being *injurious to society*;* not because God

* Most immoral habits can be proved to incapacitate men for some of their civil duties; and when this is the case, the state in punishing them

will also punish, at the day of judgment, the sin thence ensuing. On the other hand, it is less clear that the Indian government ought with a high hand to put down such nuisances in India. A new question there arises,—whether the dark conscience of the community might not see the act as one of impious persecution; whether it might not call out in them an evil enthusiasm on the side of their superstitions, and the mischief recur in other forms, and with greater malignity, until by moral agencies their minds became more enlightened. Whether this view, which is one of common sense, daily acted on, and no refinement of modern voluntaries, be true or not, (though we seem to have the authority of Moses, and of one greater than Moses, with us,) it certainly deserved a fairer statement and refutation than it has received from Dr. Arnold.

In confessing the practical difficulty of reconciling the rights of individual conscience with those of the State, he retorts, that it exists equally even if his theory be abandoned. We allow that *some* difficulty remains; but the whole weight of his objections falls on Mr. Gladstone, or on the Archbishop of Dublin, not on us. For he urges that a national Church, and much more, a *Catholic* Church, has a fearful power of social persecution if not controlled by the State, since excommunication may be a blighting infliction equivalent to martyrdom. It certainly may; and this is one more proof of the superiority of the congregational system of Church government to the national; since in the latter, the official organs of the Church necessarily become so powerful in this world, that the State must either seize them as its own, or be conquered by them. And in spite of Dr. Arnold's historical criticism on the Archbishop of Dublin's remarks, it appears to us that their spirit is true, even though their mode of expression may be unguarded. We do think that the *later* and most cruel persecutions suffered by the Christian Church, under Decius and Dioclesian, were largely prompted by fear of so dangerous a confederacy; and that those politic emperors discerned that it either must be dissolved, or would become too powerful for the empire; as it actually did.

does not go beyond the limits which we regard to be its own. If the Emperor of China were to confiscate, in whole or part, the goods of those who ruin their minds and bodies by opium, he might, or he might not, be unwise; but we should have no *prima facie* ground for protesting against his act. In our view, the reason for winking at drunkenness is, because (in one way or other) the evils contingent on a law to punish it would be worse to society than the existing evil. To speak generally, the law cannot deal with *habits* as such, it can deal only with *acts*. Where it is requisite to discriminate degrees of punishment, more discretion needs to be placed in the hands of judges or jury than they could be safely trusted with in such matters.

But we must pass to the practical modifications of his theory to which we above alluded. It has been seen what high pretensions he advances for the State as being 'the perfect Church'; elsewhere he argues, like a Greek philosopher, that 'the sovereign authority' must be not a mere 'subordinate teacher,' but the 'parental educator'; 'must regulate our particular lessons, and determine that we shall study most what is of most value.' p. 49. After reading so frightful an account of the mental slavery in which we are all to be held, it is comforting to learn (p. 53) that 'a government may not impose *its own law, whether human or divine*, upon an adverse people'; though 'a nation, acting through its government, may certainly *choose for itself* such a law as it deems most for its good'; and the only question remains, 'How far the nation or society may impose its law on a number of dissentient individuals.' (p. 54.) Thus the sovereign authority is clearly marked out as having no intrinsic right, by virtue of its organization as the government, to dictate what shall be learned or believed, but merely a right *delegated* to it from the unorganized majority of the nation; since Dr. Arnold himself has virtually reduced the question to this,—'What right have nine units of mankind to punish a tenth for not conforming to their religious worship?' We think he has made it manifest that the true reply is, '*None at all.*'

But we here touch on another point. Dr. Arnold is aware that nothing will compel religious *belief*; all that he demands is *external conformity*. Nor is he terrified by the objection that this is 'no other than the system of the old philosophers, who upheld paganism as expedient, while they laughed at it in their hearts as false' (p. 60); for he says, Christianity is so excellent, that *if* the State were but (!) the perfect Church, unbelief would be of rare occurrence, and perhaps might come to 'shock men's notions of right and wrong, as much as obscene writings now.' This is no reply at all; for in the interval, *before* that millennial state is gained, the system offers every premium to hypocrisy; and indeed, by demoralizing State functionaries, retards the happy period for which he legislates; and *after* it shall arrive, these enactments will be perfectly needless. 'States and Churches,' says he, 'should make their bond to consist in a common object and common practice, rather than in a common belief: in other words, their end should be *good* rather than *truth*.' (p. 50.) Be it so: but to hold out a bonus for hypocrisy does not promote *good*. Not a single bad man will be kept out, nor a single additional good man gained, in any office of State, high or low, by such exclusions or compulsions.

At the bottom of all his views, it appears to us that there are several erroneous assumptions, which, though he does not make

will also punish, at the day of judgment, the sin thence ensuing. On the other hand, it is less clear that the Indian government ought with a high hand to put down such nuisances in India. A new question there arises,—whether the dark conscience of the community might not see the act as one of impious persecution; whether it might not call out in them an evil enthusiasm on the side of their superstitions, and the mischief recur in other forms, and with greater malignity, until by moral agencies their minds became more enlightened. Whether this view, which is one of common sense, daily acted on, and no refinement of modern voluntaries, be true or not, (though we seem to have the authority of Moses, and of one greater than Moses, with us,) it certainly deserved a fairer statement and refutation than it has received from Dr. Arnold.

In confessing the practical difficulty of reconciling the rights of individual conscience with those of the State, he retorts, that it exists equally even if his theory be abandoned. We allow that *some* difficulty remains; but the whole weight of his objections falls on Mr. Gladstone, or on the Archbishop of Dublin, not on us. For he urges that a national Church, and much more, a *Catholic* Church, has a fearful power of social persecution if not controlled by the State, since excommunication may be a blighting infliction equivalent to martyrdom. It certainly may; and this is one more proof of the superiority of the congregational system of Church government to the national; since in the latter, the official organs of the Church necessarily become so powerful in this world, that the State must either seize them as its own, or be conquered by them. And in spite of Dr. Arnold's historical criticism on the Archbishop of Dublin's remarks, it appears to us that their spirit is true, even though their mode of expression may be unguarded. We do think that the *later* and most cruel persecutions suffered by the Christian Church, under Decius and Dioclesian, were largely prompted by fear of so dangerous a confederacy; and that those politic emperors discerned that it either must be dissolved, or would become too powerful for the empire; as it actually did.

does not go beyond the limits which we regard to be its own. If the Emperor of China were to confiscate, in whole or part, the goods of those who ruin their minds and bodies by opium, he might, or he might not, be unwise; but we should have no *prima facie* ground for protesting against his act. In our view, the reason for winking at drunkenness is, because (in one way or other) the evils contingent on a law to punish it would be worse to society than the existing evil. To speak generally, the law cannot deal with *habits* as such, it can deal only with *acts*. Where it is requisite to discriminate degrees of punishment, more discretion needs to be placed in the hands of judges or jury than they could be safely trusted with in such matters.

But we must pass to the practical modifications of his theory to which we above alluded. It has been seen what high pretensions he advances for the State as being 'the perfect Church;' elsewhere he argues, like a Greek philosopher, that 'the sovereign authority' must be not a mere 'subordinate teacher,' but the 'parental educator;' 'must regulate our particular lessons, and determine that we shall study most what is of most value.' p. 49. After reading so frightful an account of the mental slavery in which we are all to be held, it is comforting to learn (p. 53) that 'a government may not impose *its own law, whether human or divine*, upon an adverse people;' though 'a nation, acting through its government, may certainly *choose for itself* such a law as it deems most for its good;' and the only question remains, 'How far the nation or society may impose its law on a number of dissentient individuals.' (p. 54.) Thus the sovereign authority is clearly marked out as having no intrinsic right, by virtue of its organization as the government, to dictate what shall be learned or believed, but merely a right *delegated* to it from the unorganized majority of the nation; since Dr. Arnold himself has virtually reduced the question to this,—'What right have nine units of mankind to punish a tenth for not conforming to their religious worship?' We think he has made it manifest that the true reply is, '*None at all.*'

But we here touch on another point. Dr. Arnold is aware that nothing will compel religious *belief*; all that he demands is *external conformity*. Nor is he terrified by the objection that this is 'no other than the system of the old philosophers, who upheld paganism as expedient, while they laughed at it in their hearts as false' (p. 60); for he says, Christianity is so excellent, that *if* the State were but (!) the perfect Church, unbelief would be of rare occurrence, and perhaps might come to 'shock men's notions of right and wrong, as much as obscene writings now.' This is no reply at all; for in the interval, *before* that millennial state is gained, the system offers every premium to hypocrisy; and indeed, by demoralizing State functionaries, retards the happy period for which he legislates; and *after* it shall arrive, these enactments will be perfectly needless. 'States and Churches,' says he, 'should make their bond to consist in a common object and common practice, rather than in a common belief: in other words, their end should be *good* rather than *truth.*' (p. 50.) Be it so: but to hold out a bonus for hypocrisy does not promote *good*. Not a single bad man will be kept out, nor a single additional good man gained, in any office of State, high or low, by such exclusions or compulsions.

At the bottom of all his views, it appears to us that there are several erroneous assumptions, which, though he does not make

them prominent, we should call his main points. First, he assumes that common national worship is a thing intrinsically beneficial to a nation, so that a man who (unhappily) cannot join in it, is a worse citizen than another who can, and is in a manner self-excluded from all public acting. But we deny the main point. Public worship, and what is called ‘conformity,’ is a pure evil, and not a good, when it is done from hypocrisy. It is therefore preposterous to demand the outward action as an end good in itself, as Dr. Arnold would do. We will not here enlarge on the topic (which yet we are persuaded cannot be disproved), that if exclusion from public posts is a justifiable punishment for nonconformity, as Dr. Arnold thinks, it is impossible to stop short there; but the infliction of pecuniary fines (‘head-money’ exacted of *aliens* for leave to reside in the country!) becomes also justifiable; and this being allowed, there is no principle left for condemning banishment, especially if these ‘aliens’ insist on teaching and propagating their doctrines.

Next, closely akin to this, is the assumption that religion is *one element* of nationality. (Dr. Arnold counts four;—viz., blood, language, religion, and institutions, as necessary to make nationality perfect.) We think it is quite as just to say, that being educated at the same school is one element of brotherhood. ‘Whether two men are or are not of the same nation,’ it does not need philosophy to decide; it is a matter of common fact, quite as much as the question whether they are brothers. To be born of English parents, and on the soil of England, undoubtedly constitutes a man a full and perfect Englishman. He is liable to be claimed as such by the law, whatever his religious sentiments may be. He is loaded with taxes, forbidden to eat foreign corn, liable to be pressed into the militia, or (haply!) to be cruelly carried off by a naval pressgang. It is only by leave that he can go abroad, and even in foreign countries he can be claimed as a British subject by our queen’s officers. It is absurd to pretend that such a one is either more or less an Englishman, because of his secret or professed creed. Common religion may become *a bond* of nationality, as common education a bond of brotherhood; to the historian also it is a valuable test, or rather *clue*, in the case of barbarians; but it is no *element*, or ingredient of nationality. In fact, the integrant parts of our own empire have different public religious institutions. Dr. Arnold, indeed, may regard the English, Scotch, and Canadian religion as the same, because all are called Christianity; but the law does not deal with them as the same, nor is it practically true that protestantism and catholicism are (to English subjects who profess them) even a bond of nationality.

A third error, an extraordinary confusion of *morals* with

religion, is constantly showing itself in Dr. Arnold's reasonings. This we regard with perfect horror, as tending to renew the ages of bloody persecution and religious war. Strange as it may seem to impute such confusion to him, we think he justifies us, even by entitling his own views the *moral*, when it is so evident that he ought to have said the *spiritual* theory of a State. Farther; from the doctrines held by the Archbishop of Dublin, he deduces, that it would have been essentially wrong for the Christians of the Roman empire, in later times, to extinguish slavery, and gladiatorial combats, and the impure rites of Flora. 'True it is,' says he, 'that to us these institutions appear immoral or unjust, because Christianity has taught us so to regard them; but to a Roman they were privileges, or powers, or pleasures, which he could ill bear to abandon.' Yet Dr. Arnold knew as well as any man that the conscience of heathens is abundantly susceptible of seeing the moral evil of these things, and their injuriousness to a community; and he cannot have meant anything so wild, as that *we* believe them to be immoral, solely on the authority of miraculous and external testimony. Nevertheless, in the preface to his third volume of 'Thucydides,' we find the same hallucination, in his protest against the recognition of Jews as members of our nation, on the ground that this would throw our morality into confusion. It is the more extraordinary, since in the existing system, of which he does not appear to have disapproved, all that is necessary for a member of parliament is, to use the words, 'on the faith of a Christian'; and as each may interpret this for himself, men may decide (as many do) that they are 'Christians,' though they wholly reject the miraculous side of Christianity and all its distinguishing doctrines, neglect all its ordinances, and, in short, neither perform nor believe more than a Jew of cultivated mind.

We allowed that difficulties might exist in reconciling the rights of conscience and the rights of the State. One of the most striking among ourselves is, in the opposition to war-taxes on the part of the Quakers, and in the occasional endeavours to distribute among the soldiery tracts which inculcate the unlawfulness of their profession. But such difficulties must always arise, in proportion as political morals are uncertain, or are confounded with religion. At a very early period, the purer religions took morals under their care, and governments which began by assisting and ordaining religious ceremonies, soon proceeded to enforce them. After this, it became natural and ordinary to confound morals and religion, and it was only gradually that men could learn that the things of Cæsar and the things of God are separate. Dr. Arnold urges that he has on his side the great minds of every age; but we think he exceed-

ingly mistakes. *His* views are widely opposed to those of the old times, for he warmly condemns religious persecution. He wishes to admit the old principles, and to reject the old, natural, and necessary conclusions—a mere Quixotic attempt, we are persuaded. We quite admit that it is a *very old* error for the State to grasp at religious authority, but it is older still for the Priesthood to control the State; and of this Dr. Arnold strongly disapproves. ‘The State cannot abandon its responsibility,’ says he (p. 65, *Lectures*), ‘and surrender its conscience up into the hands of a Priesthood, who have no knowledge superior to its own, and who cannot exercise its sovereignty.’ What has sovereignty to do with the difficulty of yielding up one’s conscience? If the Priesthood may yield it up to the State, why may not the State yield up its own to a Priesthood? and if a Priesthood is not likely to have more knowledge than the State, is it not at least as uncertain whether a majority of the nation will be wiser than a minority? If it is unlawful (as Dr. Arnold heartily believed it) for an individual to yield up his conscience, how can it be lawful in a State, more than in a Priesthood, to expect or wish it? There is no end of the incongruities which we find in every sentence which Dr. Arnold writes on this subject. We altogether protest against the idea, that stress is to be laid on *what* former ages have thought, instead of asking *in what direction* men’s minds have expanded; and it is our unhesitating belief that the progress of growing intelligence has been uniformly towards that limitation of the functions of the State for which we contend. On the one hand, every great extension of worldly empire has either led rulers to discover that religion is not their sphere, or has produced results so cruel and horrible as to convince others of it: on the other hand, every great development of religious feeling has led to a diffusion of the same truth. Christ himself most markedly lays down, between the things of Cæsar and the things of God, a distinction, which Dr. Arnold appears as pointedly to declare not to exist at all.

‘The words *secular* and *temporal* have no place in this question, unless we believe that the God of this world is really and truly not the God of the next, and that temporal things therefore are subject to a different government from things eternal,’ &c. &c.—*Lectures*, p. 70.

The spread of the Christian religion in the first place, the Reformation at a later time, the rise of sects among the protestants—in short, every great movement of spiritual life which history narrates, has had the very same tendency. In those points which still lie on debateable ground,—i.e., which some allege to be things of God, and others to be things of Cæsar, matter for persecution must of course remain: but we assert

that the whole progress of human intellect has at all times been towards the establishing, with a more and more perfect sharpness, the division between morals and spirituals.

But, as we before said, we do not allow our own views to be a *theory* at all. We maintain that the truth is every day avowed and acted upon by all practical statesmen when put to the proof, and we claim Mr. Gladstone himself on our side. That gentleman does not desire the English government to intermeddle with the religion of the people of India, yet he holds that the Hindoos owe to our authorities the obedience and respect of subjects to rulers. This brings the whole question to a practical test in a very short compass. The duties of rulers and subjects are reciprocal. The nominal sovereign cannot claim to be any longer acknowledged as such, if he neglects his essential duties: *what* then are those duties, the performance of which on his part entitles him to say,—‘Acknowledge me as your ruler, and yield to me obedience?’ It is notorious that every power, as long as it impartially protects the persons and property of its subjects, thinks it has an ample right to demand their homage: and in this, we are satisfied, both Mr. Gladstone and Dr. Arnold will justify every government. It is words without sense to pretend that religious instruction is ‘the primary function’ of a government, while it is admitted that this function may be utterly and permanently neglected without absolving the subject from his allegiance. To talk about the superior *importance* of spiritual to worldly objects, is throwing dust into our eyes; as if the fact of having the care of armies and of finance on his shoulders made a monarch more able to provide for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, than each man for his own soul, and every wise man for that of his neighbour. We are really amazed at the stress laid by Dr. Arnold on the possession of worldly force. To control a mass of soldiers, or of policemen, is no doubt essential for him who is to enforce justice, and to maintain the peace, and to ward off foreign foes; but how it is connected with *spiritual* things Dr. Arnold gives us no hint, and yet always assumes the connexion as a fact. On the other hand, nothing is more certain than that the undisputed possession of power corrupts men’s hearts; that the struggle for it when disputed leads to a thousand demoralizing practices; that courts and cabinets are anything but the strong holds of virtue or of pure religion; that the habit of making religion a tool of State has had the most baneful tendencies; that the average morality attainable in public government must always fall at least somewhat below that which exists in the private life of the upper and middle classes; that the government, in consequence, can never be a higher reservoir of spiritual good, but, on the contrary, always tends to be a sink

of impure waters ; and that wherever it has affected a superior purity, the result has been peculiarly disastrous. The great abomination of the papal sway in Italy, after the fall of the old Roman empire, consisted in the popes' wearing so high a profession of piety, while their political position could not possibly be maintained by a scrupulous conscience. To say that a priest cannot act the king, but that a king can act the priest, without injury, is to us an unmeaning distinction. Nevertheless, what says Dr. Arnold ?

' I believe that the end and object of a Christian kingdom or commonwealth is precisely the same with that of a Christian Church, and that the separation of the two has led to the grievous corruption of both, making the State worldly and profane, and the Church formal, superstitious, and idolatrous,' &c. &c.—p. 66.

Dr. Arnold is here upon his own ground—history ; and we must presume that he wrote advisedly, yet the statement is to us absolutely unintelligible. When was the *separation* first made ? Does he mean that there was some early and happy period when the State was *not* worldly and profane, and the separation had *not yet* taken place ? And when was 'the Church' *other than* formal, superstitious, and idolatrous ? Whether we look to Pagans, Christians, Protestants, or Catholics, for a reply, we are equally embarrassed in obtaining one which shall suit his argument ; and we are driven to suppose that the age of Moses, King David, or Hezekiah, is the pattern time which he had before his eyes. Another assumption silently made in the last passage, appears to pervade his views,—that the relationship between subjects and rulers is in some way altered by their Christian profession. Originally, he discussed the ultimate end of a commonwealth as such, but now, he slips in, ' *Christian* commonwealth,' as though the end of *it* were different ; or rather, he does not seem to be aware that this is an assuming of the main point,—viz., that a commonwealth, *as such*, ought to be Christian at all, which we pointedly deny. Quite consistently indeed, Dr. Arnold holds that the State ought to exercise a ' *Christian discipline*.' It ought therefore to exclude from places of power all who are excluded from the Lord's supper. A wanton king must be deposed ; a Lord Mayor who causes scandal by gluttony must do (we suppose) religious penance. If he confesses that we are at present far enough from the possibility of executing such a scheme, what, we ask, is gained by executing one petty portion of it ? What advantage is there in excluding those who conscientiously dissent from (what is called) the national religion,—be it what it may, more or less comprehensive, more or less pure,—if it is obviously impossible to exclude the immoral, the worldly,

the grasping, the hypocritical, the careless, the ignorant, the every-way unprincipled? How miserable the satisfaction of saying,—‘True: we cannot keep out all the raff and rabble who choose to call themselves of our religion, while they disgrace it every day; but at least we do keep out those who fairly tell us that they are not of our religion at all; and a valuable principle is hereby maintained by us.’ Dr. Arnold devoutly trusts (and we with him) that a time shall come when the lion shall lie down with the lamb; but meanwhile, we would not cast our lambs into the lion’s jaws. Out of the eater may come forth meat, and out of the strong, sweetness; but until such miracles are of daily occurrence, we cannot expect spirituality to spread from the organ of worldly supremacy. As to the phrase, ‘Christian commonwealth,’ ‘Christian kingdom,’ &c., it is argumentatively sophistical, and practically inculcates a political falsehood. If our allegiance to a Christian queen had anything to do with her Christianity, it would justify our rebelling should she change her religion. Christianity surely did not come into the world to give new rights to sovereigns; a Christian sovereign, therefore, can have no other rights than those which every heathen sovereign possesses. Nor does the spread of Christianity in a nation authorize Christians, upon becoming a numerical majority, to eject the minority from the senate, the magistracy, the universities, calling it thereupon a ‘Christian’ commonwealth. All such exclusions, under whatever specious names, are essentially unjust, and have ever had the curse of God upon them.

Art. II. *The Eastern and Western States of America.* By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. 3 Vols. London: Fisher and Co.

OUR notice of the two former portions of Mr. Buckingham's work supersedes the necessity for any formal introduction of the present volumes. They partake of the same general characteristics as their predecessors; are written in an easy, flowing, and perspicuous style; are full of the results of acute observation and extensive reading, and bear evident marks of the good-will and kindly feelings entertained by their author towards the American people. The range of country included in this series extends over a much larger area than its predecessors, embracing the Eastern States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and the Western States of Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Michigan; whilst the information given respecting the history, statistics, topography, religion, manners, and customs of the several States, is equally full and satisfactory. Exceptions may still be taken

by those who are disposed to be critical, to the use made by Mr. Buckingham of the labours of others, and to the numerous extracts from the newspapers and temporary publications of America included in his volumes. For ourselves, however, we have but slight objections to prefer on these grounds, as it is an advantage of no inconsiderable order to have included within one work whatever is interesting to the general reader in the past history, as well as in the present condition and resources of the great transatlantic community. Nor must it be supposed that our author is open to the charge of plagiarism. Nothing would be further from the truth, or more unjust to his well-earned reputation. He has made no other use of prior publications than what is perfectly just and honourable, and may challenge the gratitude of his readers for the pains he has taken to digest, and to present, within reasonable limits, the historical records of the American States. Some documents might unquestionably have been omitted, and some descriptions have been curtailed with advantage, but, on the whole, we receive the work with thankfulness, and have perused it with very considerable pleasure. The following brief statement of the views with which it was commenced is fully borne out by its execution, and may be quoted in justice to the author and his publishers.

'In closing these volumes on the United States of America, in which I have endeavoured to make my readers the companions of my journey—to put before them the facts that occurred to my own observation, and the feelings and opinions they suggested to my own mind—I have necessarily extended it beyond the ordinary space allotted to works of this description. But, when I commenced the task, I prescribed to myself no limits but those which the information I desired to convey should necessarily impose. I was neither bent on producing a larger or a smaller, a cheaper or a dearer book, than others with which it might be compared. My anxious and prominent desire was, to make it comprehensive, varied, instructive, agreeable, just, and impartial—such as should live beyond the passing hour—and be a work worthy of future reference by those really seeking accurate information on the subjects connected with America, its resources, its institutions, and its people. I venture to hope that I have, in a great degree, attained the accomplishment of my wishes; and the commendations of private friends and public journals confirm me in this belief. The publishers, I think it will be admitted, have executed their part of the undertaking with due regard to the just proportions between price, quantity, and quality; and though the expense of the whole work is greater than that of its predecessors in the same track, because it embraces a much greater extent of country and subjects, yet it will not be denied that, even in a purely mercantile and pecuniary sense, it is much cheaper, in the proportion of materials given, to the price paid, than most of the recent works published on the United States.'—Vol. iii., pp. 474, 475.

His former tour, which occupied about two years, and embraced the Northern and Southern States, being completed, Mr. Buckingham, not unnaturally, concluded that a third year 'might be agreeably and advantageously employed' in visiting the Eastern and Western States, and to this conclusion we owe the volumes now before us. 'In such a tour,' he remarks, 'we thought we should have an opportunity of seeing the finest portion of the United States, and judging of its capacity and eligibility for the reception of emigrants from Europe, as well as of sailing down the beautiful river Ohio—ascending the giant Mississippi—and forming an accurate conception of the boundless prairies of the Western world, which we had so often heard described with enthusiasm by those who had rolled over their verdure-clad and flower-enamelled plains.'

Prior to setting out on this tour, our author remained some time at New York, to recover from the fatigues of his Southern journey. This sojourn afforded him an opportunity of making inquiry into the condition and habits of the free negroes, whom he had frequently heard disadvantageously compared with the slaves of the South. The result was such as might have been expected, and as all reasoning on the tendencies of the human mind would lead us to anticipate. The negroes of the North are represented as being 'as superior in character and condition to those of the South, as the intelligent and thriving artisan of England is to the wretched pauper of the most destitute parts of Spain; or, as the independent little landed proprietors of France are to the miserable serfs of the Russian soil.'

Whatever the Southern advocates of slavery may allege to the contrary, this superiority of the Northern negro is well known in their slave-markets, and secures for him a higher price than can be obtained for his Southern brother. Hence has arisen a diabolical scheme of kidnapping, to which Mr. Buckingham thus alludes:

'The superiority of the northern negroes, for intelligence and industry, is, indeed, so well known, that a set of miscreants obtain a livelihood by stealing them from the towns of the North, and carrying them off to the South for sale, where they fetch large prices. Facts, in proof of this practice, are abundant; and although the more honourable among the slaveholders of the South would denounce it in the strongest terms, yet it is one of the unavoidable consequences of the slave system; for where there are persons to purchase men as slaves, there will be no want of thieves to steal them from their homes for this purpose; the principle of political economy, that 'demand creates supply,' being as applicable to this as to any other commodity of traffic. The following paragraph, from a recent number of the Boston Transcript, will show that the practice is continued to the present period.

"The coloured lad, Sydney O. Francis, who was kidnapped by Dickinson Shearer, and sold in Virginia for 450 dollars, has been safely restored to his parents and friends at Worcester, where his father is a respectable shoemaker. The scoundrel who stole him has confessed, since his arrest and imprisonment, that he has followed the business of kidnapping for six years past, and is connected with a gang of villains, whose organization extends from New England to Virginia.—A young man by the name of Turner, not yet twenty years of age, has been arrested at Palmer, as an accomplice; and it is presumed the man Wilkinson, to whom the boy was sold by Shearer, is, in fact, one of the conspirators in this damnable business.—Another coloured lad, by the name of Hassard, of Lunenburg, in Worcester county, was also stolen, (by the same rascals, no doubt,) but has been recovered in the vicinity of Richmond, Virginia, and the man in whose possession he was found has been arrested, as an accomplice of the kidnappers."—
Vol. i., pp. 11, 12.

During his stay at New York our author attended the 'Court of Errors,' of which he gives an account that shows it to be capable of bearing comparison with the highest legal tribunal in this country.

While we remained at New York, the state senators were sitting daily, as a Court of Appeal, called technically a 'Court of Errors'—though the language of the law, which is so proverbial for its verbosity, might dispense with this unusual brevity, and call it by its more appropriate name, 'A Court for the correction of Errors.' As several of the senators resided at our hotel, I went occasionally to attend their sittings. These were held in the beautiful council-chamber of the City Hall, the lieutenant-governor of the state presiding, and the senators, to the number of about thirty, seated round a large table, as a select committee of the Houses of Lords or Commons in England. The lawyers pleaded, as with us, at a bar below the table; and, as all the matters of fact were settled before the case could be appealed, the pleadings were entirely directed to the question of the legality or equity of the judgment in the courts of law. Most of the senators took notes; and I learnt that no decision was given on any doubtful case, till the meeting of the legislature at Albany, in December; the intermediate period being used for consulting and conferring on the subject, when, by the mingling of lawyers and laymen, for the senators include both, they arrived at an equitable, and generally satisfactory conclusion. No sort of costume was worn by any one; but the proceedings were conducted with great dignity, and the most careful attention paid to the advocates by all present; so that, from the number of the judges, their habits and experience, and the pains bestowed by all on the consideration of the cases submitted to them in appeal, I should consider it to be a much better court for the correction of errors than our English House of Lords; where the chancellor and any two other peers form a quorum; and where the chancellor alone is often the only peer who pays the least attention to the case, which, having been already once decided by himself in the Court of Chancery, he cannot hear a second

time with the same impartiality as before. When a judge sits to hear an appeal to himself as speaker of the House of Lords, against a decision made by himself in the Court of Chancery, it requires but a slight knowledge of human nature to perceive the difficulty of an impartial hearing and unbiased judgment in such cases, however pure, and free from all influence of a corrupt nature, the judge may be.'—*Ib.*, pp. 18, 19.

Our traveller left New York for Maine on the 1st of October, in the hope of completing his tour through the Eastern States before the severity of winter rendered travelling impracticable. He spent some days in Boston, whose foreign trade and revenue he states to be on the increase. The morals of the town, notwithstanding individual instances of intemperance, are represented in a highly favourable light, as the following brief extract will prove.

'It may be safely asserted, that there is no town in America or England, of the same size as Boston, in which there is so little of general intemperance, or so much of order, decorum, and safety for person and property. At all hours of the day or night, men may walk in any and every part of the city and its suburbs, without the slightest danger of robbery or insult, and females may walk in perfect safety from sunset to midnight, if occasion required it, without fear of being accosted or molested by men, though there is no body of preventive police; a state of security which no large towns of England enjoy.'

'The causes of this superiority here, are many, but among them may be numbered these:—First, the certainty with which every one who is sober and industrious can earn an honest and an ample subsistence; Secondly, the almost universal habit of early marriage, the means of providing for families being within every one's reach; Thirdly, the equal diffusion of education, which gives to all the youths, of both sexes, a taste for intellectual pleasures, and substitutes lectures and exhibitions in art, science, and manufactures, for the theatre, the masquerade, and the ball; Fourthly, the strong moral sentiment against intemperance, and the legislative destruction or abolition of those facilities which dram-shops afford in most large cities for this pernicious indulgence. The law is now in full operation, which prohibits the sale of spirits in any less quantities than fifteen gallons at a time, which of course puts an end entirely to the practice of retailing it out by the bottle or the glass; and this law works so well, and has received so strongly the approbation of the general community, that it is to be hoped its example will before long be followed in England, where it would produce a greater change in the habits and aspects of the lower classes of society, and effect a greater reform in the health, industry, and morals of the labouring population, than any act of legislation ever yet devised.'—*Ib.*, pp. 46, 47.

America comprises within itself the extremes of human life. Some portions of its people are familiar with the higher forms of civilization, whilst others touch upon the region of barbarism,

and partake largely of its features. Its cities rival those of Europe in their luxurious habits and prodigal expenditure, whilst its vast wildernesses conceal a hardy and reckless race, whom no dangers can terrify, and few principles restrain. Travelling from Bagnor to Augusta by the stage, Mr. Buckingham was thrown into the company of one of the class called 'lumber men,' from whom he learnt some interesting particulars respecting these 'hewers of wood' during their winter residence in the forest.

'It is the practice for a body of men, varying from twenty to fifty, to furnish themselves with a corresponding number of teams of oxen, three yoke in each team, and large open waggons for draft; and laying in a stock of provisions for nine months, consisting chiefly of flour, pork, and coffee, to set out for the frontier of the disputed territory, and there, building themselves logsheds, to encamp for the winter, without women or children. Here they remain from November to May, cutting down trees, barking and otherwise preparing them for floating down the river. When reduced to the proper lengths, and completely stripped of branches and bark, they are drawn by the teams to the river's bank, then shut up by ice, and there deposited within booms, until the opening of the summer shall thaw the river, when they are floated down in rafts to the saw-mills on the Penobscot, and there reduced to planks and shingles for the Bangor market. The cold is here much greater, it is said, than at Bangor, though in that city it is common for the mercury to descend to thirty degrees below zero almost every winter, and instances of forty and forty-five degrees have been occasionally known. With this intense cold, however, there is always a bright sun, and all parties seem to represent the atmosphere, which is at such times dry and unvarying, to be much more agreeable to the feelings than a less degree of cold, with fluctuating weather, such as characterizes the New England spring.'

'The life led by these 'lumber-men' in their 'logging campaign' is described as a very merry and happy one. They enjoy independence of all superior control, and taste the sweets of that kind of liberty which the Desert Arabs love, and the pioneers in the Great West enjoy amid the untrodden prairies, of which they are the first to take possession. Labour is agreeable rather than otherwise; their provisions are abundant, and a bracing atmosphere and vigorous exercise give them a high relish for their food, a zest for their evening's enjoyment, and the best preparation for sound and refreshing sleep. Our companion had been nine months without seeing a house, and he preferred this mode of life so much beyond that of a city, that he always longed to get back to it again. The earnings of the men were equal to about twenty dollars a month, exclusive of their provisions, while employed in cutting, and from two to three dollars per day while 'teaming' and 'floating'; so that, like sailors, after a long voyage, they had generally a handsome sum to receive on concluding their enterprise, and, like sailors also, they usually spent it in a short space of time.'—Ib., pp. 117—119.

Like many other travellers, Mr. Buckingham speaks in high terms of the beauty of American women, or rather girls, as personal attractions seem to fade much earlier with them than with us. Their beauty, however, is wanting in the higher elements of female loveliness. It is, we apprehend, the beauty of a statue rather than of a living form, and consists in regularity of feature and symmetry of parts, more than in a spiritual expression, revealing as by magic an inner and beauteous world. Mr. Buckingham remarks,

' For exquisite loveliness of face, delicate symmetry of features, and innocent softness of expression, there are no cities in the world that possess more perfect models than are to be found in the young females of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, between the ages of 14 and 18. In general, however, the paleness of their complexion, and the gravity of their deportment, makes them deficient in that glow of health, that lustre of eye, that buoyancy of step, and that cheerful and animated flow of spirits, which distinguish the women of Europe, and give them, both in England and in France, that dominion over man, which in this country they have not yet attained.'—Ib., p. 214.

Some interesting information is furnished respecting the cotton factories of Dover and Lowell, which deserve the grave consideration of our economists. It is obvious that if our present restrictive system be continued, the Americans will be driven to depend on their own manufactories, the consequences of which to our people must be pernicious in the extreme. The injury will, of course, in the first place, fall upon our manufacturers, but it would be the height of folly to suppose that the landed interest can escape. Suffer they must, and are already doing so, but the evil will be beyond remedy if they do not speedily awaken to a larger and more enlightened view of their interests. Amongst the many follies which are cherished in the present day, none is more egregious than that which represents the landed interest as independent of our manufactures,—capable of maintaining its high rents and prodigal expenditure amidst the ruin, or even the decline, of our commerce. America has already been compelled to manufacture for herself, and unless we open our ports to her natural produce, she will speedily become our rival in every quarter of the globe, as she is already in her home markets. As yet, her resources are but partially applied to manufactures, and the tendency of capital to seek this investment may be checked by proffering her a more productive barter trade; but let the proffer be withheld a few years longer, and it will be madness to expect that our artisans should find employment, or our merchants commerce, from the United States. The rapid progress of Lowell, the chief seat of American manufacture, is thus described:—

'Lowell is one of the newest towns in America, and is strikingly characteristic of the rapidity with which settlements are formed, and cities built and peopled, in this rising country. So recently as 1813, the spot where Lowell stands was without a dwelling; but at the close of that year, when the war with Great Britain had cut off the supplies of manufactured goods from England, and when the prices of all such articles were extravagantly high, two individuals, Captains Whiting and Fletcher, conceived the idea of availing themselves of the water-power here given by the Falls of the Concord and Merrimack rivers, to establish on this spot a cotton manufactory. This was erected on a small scale in a wooden building, costing only 3000 dollars. In 1818, this was sold to Mr. Hurd, who added to it a brick factory for the manufacture of woollen goods. But in 1826, he becoming insolvent, his works were purchased by a company, and from that period the works have been so speedily extended, and the population so rapidly increased, by the capital and operations of several other companies entering into the manufacturing enterprise, that there are now ten companies, or corporations, with a capital of about 10,000,000 dollars, occupying or working thirty mills, giving employment to more than 10,000 operatives, of whom 7000 are females, and paying out 150,000 dollars a month in wages, for the manufacture of more than 8,000,000 dollars' worth of goods in the year. Lowell was incorporated as a city, in 1836, and has now a population of about 20,000 persons, with twelve churches, twenty-five schools, four banks, and six newspapers published in the week.'—Ib., pp. 293, 294.

The town is advantageously situated at the confluence of the rivers Concord and Merrimack, and already produces upwards of 52,000,000 yards of cotton cloth, of which 14,000,000 yards are dyed and printed. The condition and habits of the work-people are represented as greatly superior to those of a similar class in Britain, as the following extract will show:—

'All the men that I saw employed in either of these works were better dressed, cleaner, and appeared better fed, healthier, and more contented, than the same class of persons in England; and they have good reason to be so, as they are better paid, earning from six to twelve dollars per week, and some of the more skilful, fifteen dollars—with less cost for living, the enjoyment of all political rights, and the power at any time to emigrate to the West at little charge, whenever their wages should be in danger of being reduced. All the females that we saw, and they exceeded 3000, were still more superior to the same class of persons in England. They were all remarkably clean, well-dressed, and supplied with requisites for warmth and comfort. The windows of the room in which they worked were curtained towards the south, and in every window-seat or sill were seen exotic or native shrubs, plants, and flowers, in neatly-made flower-boxes or baskets, painted green, belonging to these young females, who cultivate them as pets or favourites, in their leisure moments, and watch their growth, their health, and their flowering, with as much interest as any

lady in Christendom. These, too, had the air of being more happy than the factory girls, as a class, in England ; and they have abundant reasons for being so, from the actual superiority of their condition, for they earn more wages, have better food and clothing, work in greater comfort, lay by more money, and rarely enter upon the occupation till fourteen or fifteen, and generally leave it before they are twenty.

' The greater number of the females employed here are daughters of the farmers in the three States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. They do not leave their homes from want, but from a love of independence, and a desire to support themselves by their own labour. They therefore rarely come to the factories till they are fifteen or sixteen, and there is a law prohibiting their being employed before they are fourteen, unless on the condition of their being at school at least three months in the year. When they come, they are in general amply provided with clothes, and every other requisite; and from the first day, they are comfortably accommodated in one of the boarding-houses belonging to the Company in whose factory they may be employed to work. These boarding-houses are neat dwellings, of brick or wood, two and three stories high, built in streets and rows by the respective Companies for their own operatives only. They are let at a rent which yields only five per cent. interest on their cost (though ten per cent. is the lowest profit on their working capital) to matrons chosen by the Company, and under their control, as well as responsible to the directors for the adoption and enforcement of such regulations as they may propose. These matrons are bound to furnish a prescribed number of meals, with regulated quantities and qualities of the articles to the young boarders at fixed rates, so that there shall be no misunderstanding on either side. The number of boarders that may be taken by each matron, who are mostly widows, is also limited; and no other persons than those actually employed in the factory to which the boarding-house belongs, are permitted to be taken in or entertained at the house, nor are any males admitted among the female boarders there.

' Among the regulations by which these establishments are governed, the following deserve mention :—1. Good behaviour in words and actions, and the constant observance of temperance and virtue, are the duties exacted from all, whether in the factory or the boarding-house, as well as diligence and subordination; and any persons violating any of the rules and regulations of either branch are to be punished with instant dismissal. 2. No ardent spirits or intoxicating drinks of any kind are allowed to be used or possessed by any persons of either sex, —agent, overseer, or operative. 3. No games of chance or hazard, such as cards, dice, or backgammon, are at any time allowed. 4. Every person employed must live in one of the boarding-houses, subject to the Company's rules, and all who are not prevented by sickness, must attend divine worship at such church as they prefer, and rigidly respect the sanctity of the Sabbath. 5. The doors of every boarding-house must be closed at ten o'clock at night, and no relaxation of this rule to be admitted on any occasion. 6. A report must be made of the mis-

conduct of any individual guilty of a breach of any of these rules, by the matron of the boarding-house, to the Directors of the Company, through the agent of the factory.

' All things considered, however, Lowell is certainly one of the most remarkable places under the sun; and it is earnestly to be desired that it should for ever continue to retain all its present features of excellence, for I do not believe there is to be found in any part of the globe a town of 20,000 inhabitants, in which there is so much of unoppressive industry, so much competency of means and contentment of condition, so much purity of morals, and gentleness and harmlessness of manners, so little of suffering from excessive labour, intemperance, or ill health, so small an amount of excitement from any cause, so much of order and happiness, so little of misery or crime, as in this manufacturing town of Lowell at the present time.'—Ib., pp. 296—303.

This is unquestionably high testimony, yet other travellers have borne the same, and its substantial accuracy may undoubtedly be relied on.

The superiority of Britain as a manufacturing country is well known to the Americans, and is dreaded by such of them as have embarked their capital in opposition to us. A general outcry is consequently made for protection to native industry, and the example of England 'in excluding all foreign grain for the protection of her agricultural interests is deemed an unanswerable argument in favour of a high tariff.' So short-sighted is human policy when the interests of a class, rather than the well-being of a community, are permitted to control its proceedings. In both countries the same fallacies are propagated to their mutual injury, and statesmen are either too ignorant or too dishonest to rectify the evil. Our agriculturists demand the exclusion of foreign corn for the protection of native industry, and the American cotton-spinner, adopting the same language, and appealing to the same selfishness, asks for a higher tariff in order to keep our goods from competing with himself in the transatlantic market. But our author will best exhibit the American feeling on this subject. He says:—

' In conversation with those interested in the business of manufacturing here, I found a very general impression, that before long, some great change must take place in the tariff of protecting duties, or in the importation of foreign manufactures, or else those of America would have to be given up. The duty on foreign cotton goods was at one time 40 per cent., and with this protection, the factories of this country were enabled to pay good wages to all those whom they employed, and realize a profit of from 15 to 20 per cent. on their capital. But by Mr. Clay's Compromise Bill, the tariff has lessened the amount of the protecting duty every two years; and in the coming year, 1842, it is to come down to its minimum of 20 per cent., and there remain permanent. At this rate, the American manufacturers say it will be

impossible to meet the competition of English goods. Already the importations are so heavy as to fill the warehouses of every city, and leave but little room for the domestic fabrics to find a sale; besides which, here, as everywhere, if a native and a foreign article be of exactly the same price and quality, most purchasers will give a preference to the one that comes from afar off. They add, that when the duty is reduced to 20 per cent., which it will be in 1842, their first step must be to reduce the wages of all their operatives. But they seem to be convinced that they will not be able to get any men to work under the present rates, as they can go to something else; they have some savings to fall back upon, and they can always emigrate to the Far West, so that it will be difficult to get male labourers, and all the operations performed exclusively by them will be necessarily suspended, unless they should be able to get Irish or Scotch emigrants to supply their places. Even the female operatives will also be unwilling to remain at less than their present rate of remuneration, as they have families to return to in the country, or they can seek other pursuits, or marry and go West with their husbands. The only remedy for this state of things appears to be the increase of the tariff or protecting duties on cotton goods, to the old standard of 40 per cent. But there will be some difficulty in this. Most of the Southern members would resist such a proposition, and many of the Western members would join them in so doing; and if they succeed in their resistance, many of the existing establishments of factories will have to be given up, and a large portion of the capital invested in them be lost to their proprietors. But the example of England in continuing her high protecting duties on grain, the chief produce of America, is continually quoted as a reason why equally high protective duties should be imposed on her manufactures. If the corn-laws should be abolished, or greatly modified in England, so as to enable the manufacturers there to produce their goods still more cheaply than at present, the crisis here apprehended would of course be greatly hastened thereby; but of this, it is to be feared, there is little hope, for some time at least.'—*Ib.*, pp. 236—238.

America, like our own country, is unhappily curst with the spirit of party, which rages with terrible fierceness throughout the States, destroying the charities of life, rendering men reckless of character and principles, and sacrificing in a thousand ways the public good. The two great parties are the Whigs and the Democrats, the former of whom must not be confounded with the Whigs of our own country. Mr. Buckingham's account of their principles is as follows:—

'The Whigs, it should be always remembered, comprehend nearly all the wealthy classes in the Union, but especially in the great cities, excepting, of course, the slave-owners and planters of the South, and the office-holders in all the States; as these regard their interests safer in the keeping of Mr. Van Buren than in that of any one who might

succeed him. The Whigs in America are formed of nearly the same classes, and hold nearly the same doctrines as the Conservatives or Tories in England. They advocate a return to ‘the good old times;’ they dislike innovations; they are dreadfully afraid of increasing the power of the democracy; they would, if they could, most willingly abridge and restrict the right of suffrage, and are for giving to property that increased weight in the scale which they call its ‘legitimate influence.’ But as the suffrage is universal, and they cannot now make it otherwise, no election can be carried without the aid of that class who compose the numerical majority, and these are the small shopkeepers, small farmers, working artisans and mechanics, and the labouring classes generally. It is found indispensable, therefore, to cultivate their good-will, and obtain their support; and for this purpose every practicable device is used. The name of the party is attempted to be made palatable to this class, by calling it by the strangely-mongrel title of ‘Democratic Republican Whigs,’ though the Whig and Democrat are the antipodes of each other, and both profess to be equally Republican. In the same spirit of a desire to conciliate the labouring classes, they affect to be wonderfully smitten with the virtue of poverty, in which they resemble the Tories at home, when they form ‘Conservative Operative Associations,’ mingle with the ‘unwashed,’ as they once called them in derision, at public dinners, and call themselves the ‘Poor Man’s Friends.’—Vol. ii., pp. 114—116.

The political partizanship of America, like that of Britain, is unreflecting, blind, and reckless. It knows no honour, and observes no law. It speaks the language of patriotism, and reasons like a sage, but its heart is devoid of generosity, and its whole aim is the advancement of self. Referring to its prevalence, Mr. Buckingham remarks:—

‘I am far from thinking, however, that this is the necessary consequence of a republican form of government, because we have seen equal recklessness and violence in France, Spain, and Portugal, under monarchical power; and in these it vents itself in civil war and massacre in large masses, so that much more blood has been shed in resistance to absolute power than can ever happen in these wars of words between republican malcontents. The evil—for evil it undoubtedly is—of want of confidence in, and respect for, the ruling authorities, so general in America, springs from a combination of causes, which would be likely to produce the same effects under a monarchy as under a republic. Among these causes, the following are perhaps some of the most prominent:—

‘1. A relaxation of parental authority, by which young boys are allowed, without check or restraint, to give loose to their unbridled passions before their reason is matured, so that they are without the guidance of rational judgment or parental supervision, and are therefore the sport of every gust of passion.

‘2. The too early stage of pecuniary independence at which the

young men arrive, which inflates them with false ideas of their consequence and importance, without their being subjected to the discipline of being obliged to labour mentally, as well as physically, for eminence in station.

' 3. The entire absence of all the softening influence of female character on their political views and agitations, women in this country seeming neither to know nor care anything about public affairs, and never being present, to awe or subdue the violence of party feeling into respectful decorum at any of their public meetings.

' 4. The too free use of tobacco and spirituous stimulants, which irritate the nervous sensibilities, and make men hot and irascible, who, under a cooler and purer regimen, would be calm and collected.

' 5. The impatience to be rich, from a belief that public estimation will be secured by this, the consequent recklessness of speculation, anxieties if successful, and morbid peevishness if unfortunate, all of which impair health, and increase fretfulness of temper.

' 6. And lastly, in the Southern States especially, the constant influence of the slave system, which trains the young mind to tyrannize over all who oppose the gratification of its will, and induces it to persecute with unrelenting severity all who successfully resist its encroachments or dictation.

' These appear to me among the most powerful of the causes that operate to produce the political violence so characteristic of American society; and whether it were an hereditary monarch and hereditary nobility that ruled them, or a president and a freely-chosen senate and house of representatives, I do not think there would be much difference in the development of these feelings. As it is, however, the evil is very great, and will require for its cure a much more powerful influence to be exercised by instruction, training, discipline, reason, benevolence, and justice, than there seems any probability of bringing into action for some time to come.'—Ib., pp. 194—196.

To such of our readers as are desirous of accompanying an intelligent, well-informed, and candid traveller, through one of the most beautiful and important sections of the North American States, we strongly recommend these volumes.

- Art. III. 1. *An Act for Marriages in England.* (17th August, 1836.)
2. *An Act to explain and amend two Acts passed in the last session of parliament for Marriages, and for registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England.* (30th June, 1837.)
3. *An Act to provide for the solemnization of Marriages in the districts in or near which the parties reside.* (7th August, 1840.)

THE 'Act' by which dissenters were allowed to be married in their own chapels, and by their own ministers, constitutes the only special boon which the government of this country has

bestowed upon them since the repeal of the 'Test and Corporation Acts,'—the only measure by which it has attempted to redress their manifold and vexatious 'grievances.' The Act is on that account a rarity; nor is it less curious as a specimen of legislation. Whether it be not a 'grievance' itself may well admit of question, or rather, can admit of no question at all. We will not say that the remedy it offers is worse than the disease which it was designed to cure, for we do not think so; but we will say that it is such a nauseous and ill-concocted compound, containing so many bitter ingredients, and those so little disguised, that we are astonished equally at the effrontery of the doctors who prescribed, and at the endurance of the patients who could swallow it. Whether our legislators in this instance were a sort of homœopathists, and thought that 'grievances,' like diseases, were best relieved by remedies which produce the like symptoms; or that counter-irritants, blisters, scarification, and cataplasms, would best mitigate the internal inflammation, we know not; but certain it is that this 'Act' for our relief inflicts nearly as much wrong as it pretends to redress. It is grossly partial, elaborately confused and complicated, extravagantly expensive in its provisions,—in a word, is framed in such a manner as to neutralize, as far as possible, the very privileges it professes to grant, and to coerce us, under the penalty of unequal charges and unmerited odium, still to repair for matrimony to the altar of the parish church. It was not till lately that we were induced to look with minute care into the provisions and machinery of this curious Act, and we pledge ourselves, before we close the present article, satisfactorily to prove every count in the indictment we have preferred against it. We shall first, however, make a few observations on the causes of the gross faults with which the 'Act' in question is chargeable—of its imperfect and anomalous character.

Far be it from us to lay the sole, or even the chief blame, on the administration who proposed and carried it. It is true that the dissenters, *as such*, are not under any considerable obligations to the late administration; on the contrary, have some solid reasons to complain of neglect and ill usage at their hands. This, however, only formed a part of their general policy of futile conciliation, pursued more systematically, perhaps, with regard to the dissenters' grievances, because they felt, and not altogether without reason, that the dissenters might be safely neglected.

But the chief blame rests with that powerful party who, for a long series of years, either neutralized or vitiated almost every good measure which the ministry proposed. Like the midwives of Egypt, they seem to have been commanded by the Pharaohs of their faction 'to destroy every manchild,' and to keep only the weaker offspring alive; and they discharged their office,

it must be confessed, with more unscrupulous fidelity than did their more conscientious prototypes. Everything that was offensive in the measures brought before them,—that is, whatsoever was chiefly valuable,—was systematically destroyed by amendments, falsely so called; and this emphatically happened with the Marriage Bill. Many of its provisions were undoubtedly most vicious, *ab initio*. But whether these might not be intended as a sop to the Cerberus whom no sops could ever propitiate, and whom yet the ministry were continually but vainly endeavouring to propitiate, we will not determine.

And yet in this unequal and unrighteous piece of legislation (as we pledge ourselves to prove it), our legislators pretended to be redressing our grievances, and vindicating our rights! Such, it appears, is the inveterate jealousy of the powerful party who assert the prerogatives of the church, that their very acts of indulgence are accompanied with insults, and their concessions are but new forms of injury. While redressing our grievances, they manage to multiply them, and rather shift the burden than lift it from our shoulders. No wonder that a shout was raised that dissenters but tardily availed themselves of the benefit of this 'Act.' It is so constructed as to circumscribe its operation within the straitest limits, and to render it as difficult as possible to derive advantage from it. Its framers are like the fox who invited the stork to a dinner, and spread the entertainment in so flat a dish that the long-necked guest could get none of it. They deserve to have their mocking hospitality repaid in the like manner. In good time, says the fable, the stork invited the fox, and took care to place the viands at the bottom of a long-necked bottle. We have no wish, however, to see the injury thus requited. Rather would we long for the day when Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, and Judah shall no longer vex Ephraim.

But is it not lamentable that the very concessions which are professedly designed to soothe and conciliate, should be poisoned with the manifestations of jealousy? It is said that there is a certain soil in Sicily so intensely bitter, that the very honey which is extracted from the flowers that grow upon it is impregnated with bitterness. We need not stay to make out the application.

That the 'Act' in question, as first passed, was at least exceedingly obscure and defective, is best proved by the tacit admission of the legislature itself, which, in the short space of three years, has passed two other Acts to explain and amend it. The original was entitled, 'An Act for Marriages in England,' and is dated 17th August, 1836. In the very next session was passed another, almost as long, 'to explain and amend both it and the

bestowed upon them since the repeal of the 'Test and Corporation Acts,'—the only measure by which it has attempted to redress their manifold and vexatious 'grievances.' The Act is on that account a rarity; nor is it less curious as a specimen of legislation. Whether it be not a 'grievance' itself may well admit of question, or rather, can admit of no question at all. We will not say that the remedy it offers is worse than the disease which it was designed to cure, for we do not think so; but we will say that it is such a nauseous and ill-concocted compound, containing so many bitter ingredients, and those so little disguised, that we are astonished equally at the effrontery of the doctors who prescribed, and at the endurance of the patients who could swallow it. Whether our legislators in this instance were a sort of homœopathists, and thought that 'grievances,' like diseases, were best relieved by remedies which produce the like symptoms; or that counter-irritants, blisters, scarification, and cataplasms, would best mitigate the internal inflammation, we know not; but certain it is that this 'Act' for our relief inflicts nearly as much wrong as it pretends to redress. It is grossly partial, elaborately confused and complicated, extravagantly expensive in its provisions,—in a word, is framed in such a manner as to neutralize, as far as possible, the very privileges it professes to grant, and to coerce us, under the penalty of unequal charges and unmerited odium, still to repair for matrimony to the altar of the parish church. It was not till lately that we were induced to look with minute care into the provisions and machinery of this curious Act, and we pledge ourselves, before we close the present article, satisfactorily to prove every count in the indictment we have preferred against it. We shall first, however, make a few observations on the causes of the gross faults with which the 'Act' in question is chargeable—of its imperfect and anomalous character.

Far be it from us to lay the sole, or even the chief blame, on the administration who proposed and carried it. It is true that the dissenters, *as such*, are not under any considerable obligations to the late administration; on the contrary, have some solid reasons to complain of neglect and ill usage at their hands. This, however, only formed a part of their general policy of futile conciliation, pursued more systematically, perhaps, with regard to the dissenters' grievances, because they felt, and not altogether without reason, that the dissenters might be safely neglected.

But the chief blame rests with that powerful party who, for a long series of years, either neutralized or vitiated almost every good measure which the ministry proposed. Like the midwives of Egypt, they seem to have been commanded by the Pharaohs of their faction 'to destroy every manchild,' and to keep only the weaker offspring alive; and they discharged their office,

it must be confessed, with more unscrupulous fidelity than did their more conscientious prototypes. Everything that was offensive in the measures brought before them,—that is, whatsoever was chiefly valuable,—was systematically destroyed by amendments, falsely so called; and this emphatically happened with the Marriage Bill. Many of its provisions were undoubtedly most vicious, *ab initio*. But whether these might not be intended as a sop to the Cerberus whom no sops could ever propitiate, and whom yet the ministry were continually but vainly endeavouring to propitiate, we will not determine.

And yet in this unequal and unrighteous piece of legislation (as we pledge ourselves to prove it), our legislators pretended to be redressing our grievances, and vindicating our rights! Such, it appears, is the inveterate jealousy of the powerful party who assert the prerogatives of the church, that their very acts of indulgence are accompanied with insults, and their concessions are but new forms of injury. While redressing our grievances, they manage to multiply them, and rather shift the burden than lift it from our shoulders. No wonder that a shout was raised that dissenters but tardily availed themselves of the benefit of this 'Act.' It is so constructed as to circumscribe its operation within the straitest limits, and to render it as difficult as possible to derive advantage from it. Its framers are like the fox who invited the stork to a dinner, and spread the entertainment in so flat a dish that the long-necked guest could get none of it. They deserve to have their mocking hospitality repaid in the like manner. In good time, says the fable, the stork invited the fox, and took care to place the viands at the bottom of a long-necked bottle. We have no wish, however, to see the injury thus requited. Rather would we long for the day when Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, and Judah shall no longer vex Ephraim.

But is it not lamentable that the very concessions which are professedly designed to soothe and conciliate, should be poisoned with the manifestations of jealousy? It is said that there is a certain soil in Sicily so intensely bitter, that the very honey which is extracted from the flowers that grow upon it is impregnated with bitterness. We need not stay to make out the application.

That the 'Act' in question, as first passed, was at least exceedingly obscure and defective, is best proved by the tacit admission of the legislature itself, which, in the short space of three years, has passed two other Acts to explain and amend it. The original was entitled, 'An Act for Marriages in England,' and is dated 17th August, 1836. In the very next session was passed another, almost as long, 'to explain and amend both it and the

General Registration Act,' dated 30th June, 1837. On the 7th of August, 1840, was passed another, entitled, 'An Act to provide for the solemnization of Marriages in the districts in or near which the parties reside;' an Act which, as we shall shortly show, needs still another Act to 'explain' its explanations, and to 'amend' its amendments.

None of the amendments in these 'Acts' touched any of the chief objections which we entertain against the original measure. They were merely explanations of its obscure and needlessly complicated provisions, or improvements of some of its technical details. That the 'Act' stood largely in need of such amendments, indeed, is admitted on all hands. More than one superintendent registrar has shaken his head, and shrugged his shoulders, when we have complained of the intricacy of some of its details and the obscurity of others, and has acknowledged that seldom has an Act of Parliament presented in its original form a more hopeful field for quibble, or occasioned more vexation and perplexity in its interpretation.

But no technical amendment whatever could correct the radical vices of such a bill. Of all such attempts at amendment, one might say what the link-boy said to Pope, when the irritable poet had refused the solicited charity with his usual oath, 'Heaven mend me if I do.' 'Mend *you*,' replied the boy; 'it would be ten times easier to make a *new* one.' To mend such a measure as that in question, would be a task as adventurous as that of the audacious quack, who promised a credulous mother the complete cure of her deformed and crippled son. 'But,' said he, 'you must let me *take him to pieces first*.'

We now proceed to state specifically the nature of the objections which we have to the bill as it at present stands. The principal, without pretending to enumerate them all, are as follows:—

I. We object to the demand of three pounds for registering our places of worship. The very permission to solemnize marriage in our chapels, is not so much granted as sold to us, the cost thereof being sixty shillings. Of this tax we should complain under all circumstances, whether equally levied on all classes of religionists or not. But it is *not* equally levied on all classes. Neither Episcopalian, nor Quakers, nor Jews, are subject to it. The Act expressly excludes them; 'they may continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to their previous usages.' A building used by episcopalians, as soon as it is consecrated, immediately comes into possession of its manifold privileges, that of solemnizing marriage amongst the rest. Episcopal consecration, which has often been represented as a very worthless ceremony, is thus proved to be at least worth sixty

shillings, which is perhaps some sixty shillings higher than we should be otherwise disposed to rate it. This exemption of episcopal places of worship may be thought only a fitting homage to the 'State Church,' though it certainly looks rather odd in an 'Act,' the very design of which is to recognise the equal rights of her Majesty's subjects to be married in the way they think best. But why should Jews' synagogues and Quakers' meetings be exempted? No answer can be returned, except that Jews and Quakers were already in possession of the privileges which we were contented long and patiently to be deprived of. Seldom before have we been so struck with the truth of the old adage, 'that possession is nine points of the law.' It is at the same time a droll reward of our patience in bearing oppression so long. Those who *would* not wait for their privileges, but compelled the legislature to concede them, are formally instated in the possession of those privileges without charge; while those who long petitioned, and petitioned in vain; who waited till it pleased the tardy government to attend to them, are charged three pounds for its own voluntary concession of a natural right! And yet (however disgraceful to the legislature) we have well deserved the treatment we have met with. The Quakers, who insisted on the possession of a right, of which no human government could equitably despoil them, and who said, 'though you should not recognise our marriages, we *will* marry in our own way notwithstanding,' deserved by their courage and consistency the privilege which they have long possessed without purchase, and which it would have been too late to offer to sell them at the rate of three pounds *per congregation*. 'Thank you—for nothing,' would have been the reply; 'we do not wish to buy what is already our own.' On the other hand, we who so long waited till the legislature should spontaneously interpose for our relief, whose timidity and indecision invited wrong as long as it could be inflicted, and partial redress when some redress became necessary, have been justly compelled to buy what never ought for a moment to have been withheld.

There is no argument whatever for the imposition of this tax, except such as would apply equally to Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews,—that is, none at all; except, indeed, that which has determined the general complexion of the 'Act' all the way through—the wish to render it as burdensome, intricate, and vexatious in its provisions as possible, and thus secure by craft that monopoly of marriage which had before been held by statute.

We shall hereafter show that nothing in the nature of the 'registration' itself could involve more than a few shillings expense. The whole process might have been of the most simple

character, especially in connexion with that general Act for the ‘Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths,’ which was framed and passed the very same session, and of course came into operation at the very same time.

The charge for registering places of worship for the celebration of marriage, was, as the bill was originally framed, fixed at five pounds. This was afterwards reduced to three. Even this will abstract a larger sum from the pockets of dissenters than would at first sight be supposed. The places of dissenting worship to which the provisions of this act extend, are about eight thousand, and upon the supposition that all are registered, between twenty and thirty thousand pounds must be paid for the gracious permission to avail ourselves of a natural right, which Episcopalian, Quakers, and Jews, enjoy without any charge whatever. More than twelve thousand pounds have been already paid.

The injustice of this charge is the more apparent, when we consider,—first, that our places of worship have already paid a heavy duty to government in the shape of the tax on the materials employed in their erection, from which episcopalians are exempted. Secondly, that they have paid another heavy duty when their deeds were enrolled in Chancery.

Its unreasonableness is further apparent when it is considered that the said places have been already duly registered as places of worship; and all that is necessary is a satisfactory certificate at the General Registration Office, that they will also be used for the solemnization of marriages; the expense of which certification, at a moderate charge, might be half-a-crown, or at a very exorbitant one, twice that amount.

But the injustice—the artful injustice of this process of ‘registration,’ does not end here. Not only must every place of worship now built pay the demand of three pounds—not only must every new place that is built do the same throughout all time,—but if a congregation remove to any other building, they must pay over again for the ‘substitution’ of the new building for the old.’

Nor are our objections to this unjust portion of the bill yet exhausted. Before a chapel can be registered at all, it must have been used as a place of worship for one year, and then two certificates must be forwarded to the registrar, signed ‘by *twenty* householders at the least,’ to the effect, ‘that such building has been used by *them* during, at the least, one year, as their usual place of public religious worship, and that they are desirous that such place should be registered as aforesaid;’ each of the certificates being further signed by the proprietor or trustee. The following are the clauses of the ‘Act’ which provide for this registration; and albeit that ‘Acts’ of Parliament are not the most entertaining

reading in the world, we request the attention of the reader to every syllable of them:—

' And be it enacted, that any proprietor or trustee of a separate building, certified according to law as a place of religious worship, may apply to the superintendent registrar of the district, in order that such building may be registered for solemnizing marriages therein, and in such case shall deliver to the superintendent registrar a certificate, signed in duplicate by twenty householders at the least, that such building has been used by them during one year at the least as their usual place of public religious worship, and that they are desirous that such place should be registered as aforesaid, each of which certificates shall be countersigned by the proprietor or trustee by whom the same shall be delivered; and the superintendent registrar shall send both certificates to the register general, who shall register such building accordingly in a book to be kept for that purpose at the General Register Office; and the registrar general shall indorse on both certificates the date of the registry, and shall keep one certificate with the other records of the general register office, and shall return the other certificate to the superintendent registrar, who shall keep the same with the other records of his office; and the superintendent registrar shall enter the date of the registry of such building in a book to be furnished to him for that purpose by the registrar general, and shall give a certificate of such registry under his hand, on parchment or vellum, to the proprietor or trustee by whom the certificates are countersigned, and shall give public notice of the registry thereof by advertisement in some newspaper circulating within the county, and in the 'London Gazette'; and for every such entry, certificate, and publication, the superintendent registrar shall receive at the time of the delivery to him of the certificates the sum of three pounds.

' And be it enacted, That if at any time subsequent to the registry of any building for solemnizing marriages therein, it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the registrar general that such building has been disused for the public religious worship of the congregation on whose behalf it was registered as aforesaid, the registrar general shall cause the registry thereof to be cancelled; provided that if it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the registrar general that the same congregation use instead thereof some other such building for the purpose of public religious worship, the registrar general may substitute and register such new place of worship instead of the disused building, although such new place of worship may not have been used for that purpose during one year then next preceding; and every application for cancelling the registry of any such building, or for such substitution and registry of a substituted building, shall be made to the registrar general by or through the superintendent registrar of the district; and such cancel or substitution, when made, shall be made known by the registrar general to the superintendent registrar, who shall enter the fact and the date thereof in the book provided for the

registry of such buildings, and shall certify and publish such cancel or substitution and registry in manner herein-before provided in the case of the original registry of the disused building; and for every such substitution the superintendent registrar shall receive, at the time of the delivery of the certificate from the party requiring the substitution, the sum of three pounds; and after such cancel or substitution shall have been made by the registrar general, it shall not be lawful to solemnize any marriage in such disused building, unless the same shall be again registered in the manner herein-before provided.'

From all which it appears that before any marriage can be celebrated in a dissenting chapel, the following things are necessary:—1. The place must have been open for public worship for a twelvemonth. 2. Twenty householders, *at least*, must sign their names to a certificate, to the effect that *they* have used it for their place of worship for that space of time, and that they desire its registration. 3. The said certificate must be signed by the proprietor or trustee. 4. Three pounds must be paid for the registration.

Who can wonder that many small places of worship have never been registered yet, and are never likely to be registered at all? In many of them, as marriages would be solemnized but seldom, it might justly be a question with the congregations, whether they could afford to pay for such a rare luxury. In some cases, it might be difficult to make up the requisite number of twenty *householders*, who could truly say that they had used the chapel as their usual place of worship for a twelvemonth; or where there are but a few exceeding that number, to find twenty who all concur in the propriety of paying three pounds out of their poverty for the privilege. There are very many small congregations in the country that would certainly be in this predicament. The consequence is, that when a marriage is to be solemnized between any two of their members, the parties must either repair to the parish church; or (which would of course generally be impracticable) reside in another district for the time requisite to empower them to be married in it.

If it be said that the marriages in such small congregations cannot be very frequent, and that therefore the injury cannot be very great, we reply first, that the injustice itself is just the same, whether few or many are touched by it; secondly, that it is chiefly the poor, those who cannot help themselves, who are the objects of it; and thirdly, that though the marriages in any one of these very small congregations may be few, yet that as there are some hundreds of such small congregations, the number is altogether very considerable, and the fees thence arising, not altogether unworthy of the rapacious spirit of that church which

never refuses anything it can get, whether it be great tithes or small, munificent grants of public money or the fourpenny Easter offering; which, like another greedy and insatiable visitor—

‘Pulsat æquo pede
Pauperum tabernas, regumque turres.’

The tendency, however, of all these vexatious and complicated regulations is unquestionably to circumscribe the operation of the ‘Act,’ to diminish, either by real difficulties, or difficulties of form, the chance of the dissenters’ extensively availing themselves of it. Nor have we the slightest doubt that the conditions of registration have had this effect.

We have said that, in connexion with the ‘Act’ for the Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths, nothing could well be more simple than might have been this portion of the Marriage Act. In order to guard against the alleged danger of clandestine marriages, (for which, however, there are far greater facilities in the establishment than there ever are out of it) the names of some few householders, say of five or ten at most, together with that of the proprietor or trustee, might have been required by the Act previous to registration, and a few shillings, at the utmost, charged for entering the place on the registry and publicly notifying such registration. Nothing, assuredly, ought to have been paid for the civil right itself. If it be said that some expenses must be incurred, we reply, that no purpose but that of extortion can be answered by making them more than a few shillings; and that, at all events, the argument, if worth anything, ought to apply to Jews and Quakers as well as all other classes of religionists. Why are they exempted? If they can do without three pounds’ worth of forms, so can we. If we cannot, neither can they.

II. We object to the fee demanded on behalf of the registrar present at the marriage, which is ten shillings when the marriage is by licence, and five shillings when without. It will doubtless be replied, that it cannot be expected that the registrar should attend for nothing. We reply, certainly not; but then who wants him to attend at all? There are ample safeguards for the due performance of the marriage without his presence,—at least, as ample as are those of the church of England. The place must have been duly registered for the celebration of marriage. Notices of the intended marriage from both parties must have been sent in to the superintendents of their respective districts; these certificates are in the superintendent’s hands seven days before the marriage can be performed, even by licence, and three weeks if it is to be without; in the latter case, the said notices are read at the weekly meetings of the Board of Guardians. All this (especially if the marriage be by licence, which must be

granted with the usual forms,) one would think quite sufficient to insure security against fraud. Nevertheless, it is precisely in the case of licence that the registrar receives most; his presence at other times is supposed to be worth only five shillings. If you have laid out three pounds on a licence, his value immediately rises one hundred per cent., and he receives ten!

The above precautions might surely be considered sufficient without the superintendent's presence. If not, we again say, they are at all events more than the church has to trust to. Yet the churchman is exempted from all such tax as that of the registrar's fees.* Provided the previous forms of law have been duly attended to in the publication of banns, or the purchase of a licence, as the case may be, the clergyman is thought to be quite competent to attest and certify the marriage. Why the dissenting minister, or the officers of a dissenting church, should be thought not competent to attest the due performance of the marriage, which must be in a registered place of worship after due notice, and by licence or certificate, we cannot divine. A marriage cannot be performed in a place not registered, nor until the proper certificates have been for the due period issued. The provisions of the Act, even without the enforced presence of the superintendent, are of such a nature, and the motives to comply with its provisions so strong, that, it may be safely said, a clandestine marriage would be an event of a very rare occurrence. His presence provides no additional safeguard worth speaking of. It would be the interest of all parties performing the marriage in any licenced building, both for the perpetuation of the privilege, and to escape the serious penalties attached to a violation of the law, to see that the conditions prescribed by the Act had been duly complied with. At all events, the cases, if any there be, of clandestine and illegal marriage, which might arise from dispensing with the presence of the registrar, are no more likely to occur amongst us than amongst Episcopalians, Quakers, and Jews, who are all exempted from the regulation, and would be so extremely rare, that it seems both a most costly and unjust way of preventing it to levy on every dissenter who chooses to marry, a tax of either ten or five shillings!

In addition to all the safeguards provided by the forms preliminary to marriage, we must take into account the penalties

* It may perhaps be said that the clergyman officiating is entitled to some fee. We reply, that the fee which can be demanded by *law* is extremely small; and as to gratuities, we should hope, that whatever the dissenter would give to the clergyman, he would give at least as much to his own minister. The *legal* expenses of marriage to the dissenter are, as we shall hereafter have occasion to remark, *about half as much again* as to the churchman.

attached to an infringement of the Act, and we shall then see how superfluously cautious the legislature has been in enforcing the superintendent's presence. The dissenting minister who should 'knowingly and wilfully solemnize a marriage, except in a registered building, or without the notice prescribed by law, without the usual form of certificate or licence, or within the dates prescribed, would still by the Act be guilty of felony.' He is, as it stands, *also* guilty of felony if he shall solemnize a marriage, though all the previous conditions shall have been strictly complied with, without the presence of a registrar. So that if the registrar should happen to have a short memory, or be seized with a fit, or not gifted with punctuality, or misunderstand his instructions, or lose his memorandum of them, or go to the wrong chapel, or do or omit to do any one of the thousand things which might prevent his being at a certain spot at a certain minute, the marriage must be postponed. There is no help for it; though the wedding party and the officiating minister may be all there, they cannot proceed: they are cyphers without the registrar.

It may be said that most of the above contingencies might, peradventure, befall the officiating minister himself. We acknowledge it, and for that very reason cannot think it wise to *double* the risk. It is bad enough that any important act in this uncertain life should be made absolutely dependent on any *one* person. How very desirable is it that it should not be dependent on *two*. Moreover, in case of anything befalling a minister, another could be had. But we cannot go to any registrar. It must be *the* registrar, or none.

It is thought quite safe, nevertheless, to entrust Jews and Quakers with the privilege of celebrating marriages in unregistered places, and *without the presence of a registrar*; the required notice of marriage to a superintendent, and the superintendent's certificate being considered, as they ought to have been in every case, ample security against clandestine marriages. Those who would violate, and could elude these conditions, would not fail to violate the rest, whether they be Episcopalians, Jews, Quakers, Independents, Baptists, or Methodists.

The following is the liberty granted to the Jews and Quakers:—

'And be it enacted, That the Society of Friends commonly called *Quakers*, and also persons professing the Jewish religion, may continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of the said society and of the said persons respectively; and every such marriage is hereby declared and confirmed good in law, provided that the parties to such marriage be both of the said society, or both persons professing the Jewish religion respectively, provided also, that notice to the registrar shall have been given, and the registrar's certificate shall have issued in manner hereinafter provided.'

The enforced presence of the registrar is further shown to be unnecessary, (except for the purpose of increasing expense and vexation,) inasmuch as though he is present, the law demands the very same attestations of the actual performance of the ceremony as would be amply sufficient without it. The marriage must be attested by the signatures of the officiating minister, of the parties married, and of two witnesses. The only thing is, that we are supposed to be incompetent honestly to transmit such a document to the registrar for entry in his book.

But whether the presence of the registrar be designed for the greater security against clandestine marriages or not (and we think we have proved that there are ample securities without it), the argument is irresistible, that it is a security which Episcopilians, Quakers, and Jews, are not obliged to offer. No reasonable man will pretend that there is greater danger of clandestine marriages amongst Independents, Baptists, or Methodists, than amongst Episcopilians, Quakers, and Jews. The regulation in question, therefore, can never cease to be looked upon as a deliberate and humiliating stigma upon us.

We know of nothing more mean in the whole annals of unequal legislation, than the distinctions made in some parts of this 'Act.' Thus the certificates of the superintendent or superintendents, granting leave of marriage, are to be delivered, if the marriage be in the church of England, to the clergyman; if amongst the Quakers, to anybody they may appoint; if among the Jews, to the officer of the synagogue; but amongst dissenters, no officiating minister is to be entrusted with the precious document; it must be delivered to the registrar.

Again, in the statement of the penalties attached to the violation of any of the provisions of the 'Act,' who but must feel indignant at the invidious exceptions? That is felony in an Independent, which is no crime at all in a Quaker or a Jew.

' And be it enacted, That every person who after the said first day of March shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in *England*, except by special licence, in any other place than a church or chapel in which marriages may be solemnized according to the rites of the church of *England*, or than the registered building or office specified in the notice and certificate as aforesaid, *shall be guilty of felony* (*except, in the case of a marriage between two of the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers, according to the usages of the said society, or between two persons professing the Jewish religion, according to the usages of the Jews*); and every person who in any such registered building or office shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in the absence of a registrar of the district in which such registered building or office is situated shall be guilty of felony; and every person who shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in *England* after the said first day of *March* (except by licence) within twenty-

one days after the entry of the notice to the superintendent registrar as aforesaid, or if the marriage is by licence within seven days after such entry, or after three calendar months after such entry, shall be guilty of felony.'

As to the argument, that Quakers and Jews were already in possession of certain privileges, and it would have been unwise to dispossess them, the answer is obvious. If it be safe and proper that they should be entrusted with such privileges, other religious bodies may be entrusted too. If the regulations in question were thought only an adequate security, then they should have been applied, with impartial justice, to the whole nation. The obnoxious provisions of which we complain, are either necessary for the protection of the community or not; if necessary, none should have been exempt from them; if unnecessary, on none ought they to have been imposed.

We must avow our belief that the attendance of the registrar, unequally and partially as it is enforced, was designed for no other purpose than that of increasing the expense, and rendering the operation of the Act more complicated and difficult. By such means it was hoped that dissenters might be deterred from extensively availing themselves of the privilege of marriage by their own ministers, and that the church might still enjoy the greater portion of the marriage fees. This we firmly believe to have been at the bottom of it.

III. We object to the limited benefit accruing to the dissenting purchaser of a licence, as compared with that conferred by such an instrument on the members of the established church. Church people must either have the banns published for three successive Sabbaths, or purchase a licence, in which latter case the whole nuisance of banns is got rid of, and the parties may be married immediately. Instead of banns, dissenters must submit to having the notice of marriage read 'three successive times, in three successive weeks, at the weekly meeting of the Board of Guardians.' This is to supply the place of the publicity of banns. But if a licence be purchased, the parties do not escape, as in the church, the whole of this edifying and interesting exhibition. The period within which the marriage must not be solemnized, is abridged from twenty-one to seven days; that is, after seven days, the superintendent may issue his certificate. But during those seven a weekly meeting of the guardians must take place, and the notice of marriage, *may, according to the Act,* be read *once*, notwithstanding the licence; and if read there once, it might as well be read half a dozen times. We believe, however, that, in point of fact, the notice of marriage, if to be by licence, is often not so read at all. This, however, is a courtesy in those

who are entrusted with the administration of the law, and is not provided for by the Act itself. If we might speculate on the causes of this connivance, we should say, that it was felt there might be some danger lest 'licences' should be found of no value whatever; or of so little, as to render them no longer a saleable commodity. As the Act is constituted, they are so worthless, that we do trust that dissenters will forego the use of them, and thus compel an alteration of the law. Churchmen certainly get, if not a penny-worth for their penny, some considerable compensation. Dissenters, if the superintendents happen to deem it necessary to act upon the letter of the law, do not get anything. The three pounds may just as well be thrown into the dirt.

The granting of a licence to a member of the church of England is the simplest thing in the world. All he has to do, is to go at once to the surrogate, make oath that the parties designing marriage have lived fifteen days in the place wherein the church in which they wish to be married is situate, and immediately, without description of persons, without any publicity whatever, the parties may proceed to be married. Dissenters, on the other hand, cannot get the licence at all till seven days after they have given the superintendents of the district in which they dwell the ordinary notice of marriage, containing full particulars of age, profession, place of abode, &c. Talk about fraud! There never was a system which afforded so many facilities for clandestine marriages as that of the church of England. Nor do we wish that there should be so little security amongst dissenters—what we complain of is the unequal legislation. The notice of marriage, if compulsory in any case, should be rendered compulsory in all, previous to granting licences. But it will be seen, that though we do not object to the notice of marriage, previous to granting a licence, we do object to that mean and artful arrangement by which an interval of *seven* days is demanded before the licence can be issued, thereby insuring, so far as the 'Act' is concerned, one of those exhibitions before the Board of Guardians, to avoid which is the very object of purchasing the licence. Since the avoiding of publicity is the motive for purchasing a licence, (whether within the church or not) why not put us, in *this* respect, on a level, and while demanding, and very properly demanding, in all cases, the notice of marriage, with description of persons, &c., empower the superintendent to issue his licence within four or six days?

IV. The last thing we think it worth while to notice in the present 'Act' is, the unequal conditions it imposes respecting the *place* in which marriage is to be celebrated. The regulations on this subject are contained in the last of the three 'Acts' mentioned at the head of this article. After stating, in the preamble,

'that whereas it is expedient to restrain marriages under the late Act from being solemnized out of the district in which one of the parties dwells, unless either of the parties dwells in a district within which there is not any registered building wherein marriage is solemnized according to the form, rite, or ceremony the parties see fit to adopt,' it is therefore declared and enacted, 'that it shall not be lawful for any superintendent registrar to sign any certificate of notice of marriage when the building in which the marriage is to be solemnized shall not be within the district wherein one of the parties shall have dwelt for the time required by the late Act,' except where one of the parties makes a long declaration, that there is, in the district in which the marriage is to be solemnized, no place of worship registered in which the ceremony can be performed, according to the form preferred by the party. As a consequence, it often happens that persons cannot be married in the chapel they ordinarily attend, because, though they may be within half a mile of it, such chapels are not in the district in which the party dwells, or in the nearest district to it. Now Quakers and Jews are thus coolly exempted from all observance of this statute.

'Provided always, and be it enacted, That, notwithstanding anything herein or in the said recited Acts or either of them contained, the Society of Friends commonly called Quakers, and also persons professing the Jewish religion, may lawfully continue to contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of the said society and of the said persons respectively, after notice for that purpose duly given, and certificate or certificates duly issued, pursuant to the provision of the said recited Act of His late Majesty, notwithstanding the building or place wherein such marriage may be contracted or solemnized be not situate within the district or either of the districts (as the case may be) in which the parties shall respectively dwell.'

Again we say, either the vexatious regulations of this Act are necessary for the community at large, or not; if necessary, it is a flagrant impropriety that any should be exempted from them; if unnecessary, that any should be subjected to them. For our own parts, we believe that the notice of marriage, the required certificate or licence, and the properly attested declaration to the superintendents, of the solemnization of the marriage within the period specified by law, would be a sufficient security, and that with such securities the parties might be left, like the Jews and Quakers, to be married in any district they thought proper. It must be in some registered building, and all the superintendents having printed lists of the registered chapels, might easily, by reference, see that this condition too had been duly complied with. As it is, the jealousy of allowing a man to marry out of

his own district often gives rise, as we can bear witness, to considerable inconvenience.*

But the best test of the inequitable legislation which distinguishes this 'Act' is found in the difference of expense to which the churchman and dissenter are severally subjected in every individual case of marriage. The dissenter who marries by licence, must pay altogether **FIVE AND TWENTY SHILLINGS** more than the churchman who marries by licence! The whole legal expense of the churchman is about **THREE POUNDS**; that of the dissenter, **FOUR POUNDS FIVE**. We have not, of course, taken into account the gratuities bestowed, on these occasions, to the officiating ministers on either side, for they do not affect the calculation. As we have already said, whatever in the shape of present or gratuity the dissenter would have given to the clergyman of the parish church, he would feel equally disposed to give to his own minister. We are speaking of the money which *must* be paid; and we repeat that the dissenter who is married by licence, has to pay five and twenty shillings more than the churchman who is married by licence. As to the poor man, who cannot afford to buy a licence, the difference is not so great in

* So peculiar is the wording of this little 'amended Act,' that many readers, and even some superintendents have, upon a first perusal, supposed that, before the required indulgence can be conceded, the parties must declare that there is not, in the district of *either*, any registered place in which marriage can be solemnized according to the form or rite they most prefer; and that if there be no such place in the district of the bride, for example, while yet there is one in that of the bridegroom, (although he may live three hundred miles off,) thither must the lady repair rather than go half a mile to the next district. This, however, we hold not to be the right interpretation of the Act. 1. From the phrases, 'unless *either* of the parties dwells in a district,' &c., 'that there is not within the district in which *one* of the parties dwells, &c., any registered building,' &c. 2. From the absurdity of supposing the contrary. For if we suppose both parties required to make the declaration, each for his or her own district, before the benefit of the Act can be claimed, then, if James Crow, belonging to the sect of Jumpers, and living just on this side the Tweed, be engaged to Mary Lightfoot, of the same sect, living near the Land's End, and there be no registered chapel belonging to the Jumpers in Mary's district, though there may be one in the district adjoining, yet she cannot be married there unless there be also no registered building in James' district; if there be, contrary to all principles of common sense, and all feelings of decorum, Mary must travel five hundred miles to be married in her lover's district. This consequence we say is so absurd, that it is impossible to believe it to be the meaning of the 'Act.' 3. We argue the same from the acknowledged permission which the law gives to the parties, of being married in either district, when both do not dwell in the same. If then, having decided upon one or the other, there be no registered place in that district, in which the parties can be married according to that 'form, rite, or ceremony,' they approve, it seems to be the object of the present Act to allow them the privilege of being married in the next adjoining district in which there is such a chapel. As the declaration,

amount, but still there is a difference, and, in *proportion*, a still greater. The five shillings he has to pay for the enforced presence of the ‘registrar,’ increase the expense of marriage to him more than *fifty per cent.* Shall these distinctions, at once so needless and so humiliating, be allowed to remain any longer? We have no more to say on this point, than that if dissenters submit to them, they deserve to submit to them. Their stupid patience invites oppression, and they may depend upon it that the invitation will be accepted.

Such is this singular attempt at the redress of our grievances! Dissenters must purchase the privilege of marriage by paying for the registration of the chapels in which it is solemnized; they must pay, in every individual case of marriage, beyond all comparison, more than the favoured churchman; many of the provisions of the ‘Act’ are needlessly minute and complicated; many humiliating and invidious. If it be asked, How is it that in a matter so simple, and which admitted of such a plain and easy remedy—even the remedy which, by this very ‘Act,’ is extended to the Jews and Quakers—such pains should have been

however, required of the parties seeking the benefit of this ‘Act’ is a curiosity in its way, and may seem to admit of different interpretations, where all should have been as plain as a pikestaff, we subjoin it for the reader’s edification, leaving him to digest and expound it to the best of his ability. If *all* the bracketed clauses are to be filled up, the Act simply requires an impossibility, for it clearly implies that if there be no registered place in either district, though these districts may be five hundred miles asunder, that the district having such registered place which is nearest to the one will be always nearest to the other. This alone would establish the interpretation of the law for which we have pleaded.

‘I, the undersigned and within-named *James Smith*, do hereby declare, that I, being [*here insert, a member of the church of England, a Roman-catholic, Independent, Baptist, Presbyterian, Unitarian, or such other description of the religion of the party*], and the within-named *Martha Green*, in solemnizing our intended marriage, desire to adopt the form, rite, or ceremony of the [*Roman-catholic church, Independents, Baptist, Presbyterians, Unitarians or other description of the form, rite, or ceremony the parties state it to be their desire to adopt*]; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief there is not within the superintendent registrar’s district in which [*I dwell*], or [*in which the said Martha Green dwells*], any registered building in which marriage is solemnized according to such form, rite, or ceremony; and that the nearest district to [*my dwelling place*], or to [*the dwelling place of the said Martha Green*], in which a building is registered wherein marriage may be solemnized according to such form, rite, or ceremony, is the [*here insert the name by which the superintendent registrar’s district is designated*]; and that we intend to solemnize our marriage in the registered building within that district known by the name of [*here insert the name by which the building has been registered*]. Witness my hand this *Tenth day of August One thousand eight hundred and forty.*

(Signed) *James Smith.*

[The *Italics* in this Schedule to be filled as the case may be.]

taken to render of little value the professed instrument of our relief, the only answer that can be returned is the one we have already so often given; that it was the very object of the church party to retain, as long as they could, and as far as they could, a monopoly which at once gratified their love of power and their love of money,—which was profitable to them and humiliating to us. They wished, if something must be done, to do as little as they could; and while professing to relieve us, sought to neutralize the very remedy itself. They knew that in proportion as they could render the Act troublesome, vexatious, and expensive, in that proportion would they limit and circumscribe its operation; in that proportion would they still retain the marriage office, and better still the marriage fees, in their own hands.

In this we acknowledge they have been tolerably successful. For though we have often blamed dissenters for the limited extent to which they have availed themselves of the present 'Act,' we must confess that after a diligent inspection of it, we think great excuses are to be made for them. We know there are ministers who are so disgusted with its partiality and injustice, that they have declared they will never sanction it by registering their chapels for the solemnization of marriage. In this we think them wrong; and yet we can hardly wonder at their conduct. Three things we consider incumbent on the dissenters in this matter. First, to avail themselves of the Act, such as it is, till they can get its obnoxious provisions repealed or modified. This we think they should do on many grounds. The 'Act' does at least secure us the privilege of being married by our own ministers, and at our own chapels, and thus far deprives the church of her monopoly, even although it makes us pay unjustly for it. Consistency also seems to demand that we should avail ourselves of it. To do the contrary, is to do the very thing which the church hopes we may do, and to which we doubt not, it was its very object to drive us, by this grossly partial and unjust legislation. Secondly, we think dissenters should defeat the extortionate spirit of the 'Act' by refusing to purchase the 'licence.' By the Act, that licence grants nothing more than the privilege of having the names of the parties to be married read only once instead of thrice, before the Board of Guardians; and, as we have already remarked, if read once, they might as well be read half a dozen times. If anything more be granted, it is owing to the courteous or interested connivance of particular superintendents. The law itself gives little more than allowing your certificate of marriage to be printed in *red* ink instead of *black*. If there are any persons who think this worth three pounds, who have a particular love for very expensive, and at the same time very insipid luxu-

ries, they belong to a class with whom it is in vain to argue. We shall merely remark farther on this head, that if dissenters were generally to avail themselves of the 'Act,' and at the same time disappoint its spirit of extortion, by refusing to purchase the worthless licence, the Act would soon be altered. Our enemies would give up, rather than that the trade in licences should cease. Thirdly, we think that dissenters should immediately petition for an alteration of the 'Act.' And their demands should at least extend to the following points :—They should demand that their chapels should be registered for nothing, or for the few shillings which will really cover all expense that may be incurred. They should demand that licences should secure us, if not all that they give the churchman, yet a complete exemption from all liability to have the notice read before the Board of Guardians. They should demand that the registrar's presence, and the registrar's fee, should be both dispensed with. And they should demand also, that parties should be married in any district that may be most convenient to them; provided they give the required notice of marriage, obtain the required certificate, or licence, as the case may be, be married in some registered place of worship, and transmit the proper attestations of the marriage to the same superintendent who has issued the certificate or licence. This would be ample security against fraud. Further restrictions are needless, oppressive in their character, and are not demanded of all. Now we say, let all be exempted or none.

We are glad to see that the first recommendation dissenters are already beginning consistently to act upon. They are beginning to see the absurdity of professing themselves dissenters, while they yet repair to the altar of the parish church. It is high time. Much as we condemn the injustice of the Act which we have been criticising, we cannot but be sensible that there are many inconsistent dissenters, who would not pretend that their inconsistency in being married at church was the result of such injustice, or would assign that as the cause of it. There will always be, in all communities, timid creatures, who dare not act without precedent; who must see others, and others for whom they have respect, taking the lead; who are strictly gregarious, and would be hardly got to go to heaven itself, if they were compelled to travel there alone. There are others who fear to encounter a little odium; others, in whose bosoms, though they would be ashamed to own so childish a prejudice, there are the remains of a lurking superstition in favour of the church on this particular point. With some, still more unworthy of the name of rational beings, it is simply made a question of *associations*. They recollect that their grandfathers and great grandmothers were married at church—they think of the picturesque old country

church, and the merry bells, and the wedding procession all in the sunshine, and the ring, and the garlands of flowers, and the old customs. They call to mind pretty passages of poetry, and ‘Ah!’ they are ready to sigh, ‘we have no such associations with the chapel ceremony !’ To all which we beg to say, that associations, however attractive, however poetical, ought not to regulate our practical conduct in any important matter. There are many conscientious dissenters (we are ourselves of the number) who are enchanted with the music of the church bells, associated as they are with images of rural beauty and sabbath quietude, and with some of the most beautiful and touching passages in our poetical literature ; but they are not led, perforce, as by some blind, irrational instinct, to forsake the place of worship and the religious service to which their better convictions lead them. And secondly, we may observe, for the comfort of these sensitive and imaginative creatures, that similar associations—not perhaps *quite* so picturesque, because they must want that element of interest, antiquity—will be sure to spring up in connexion with the wedding day, wherever and with whatever rites the marriage ceremony may be performed. None, we presume, will need to ask why ; or if there are any such, all we can say is, that this is not the place to read a lecture on the philosophy of our associations. Suffice it, that they all borrow beauty, or the reverse, their bright or their sombre hue, from our happiness or our misery.

The repugnance which many of the weak or inconsistent felt to avail themselves of the new Marriage Act, was still further strengthened by the infamous arts to which our adversaries were not ashamed to resort. Not contented with having robbed us of our rights so long ; not contented with insulting us by grossly partial legislation in the very Act by which they professed to restore them, they resorted, in many cases, to the most heartless and cruel calumnies, because we contended that, however right and fit it was that marriage, like every other important transaction in life, should be hallowed by ‘the word of God and prayer,’ it was in itself a civil contract, and nothing more ; because we would not abuse common sense or common language, by making it, with these superstitious men, a sacrament or a something, nobody knows what, between a sacrament and no sacrament. They did not scruple to hold up dissenting marriages as little better than a sort of licensed concubinage—as unions from which ‘God was excluded’—as ‘atheistical,’ and we know not what. All which, being interpreted, meant just this—‘we are mad that you have escaped from under our petty tyranny, and that we can no longer pocket your fees—if we cannot oppress you, we will still endeavour to intimidate you ; and, if you will not be intimidated, you

shall, at all events, be insulted.' It is in no other way that we can interpret the disgusting ribaldry in which our enemies indulged, for we cannot imagine them to have been idiots enough to believe all the nonsense they uttered. We rejoice to believe that their violence and insolence were, on the whole, useful to us. If they frightened some few timid persons amongst us, they disclosed to the eyes of the majority the true spirit and the real motives by which they were animated.

Art. IV. *Edwin the Fair. An Historical Drama.* By Henry Taylor, Author of 'Philip Van Artevelde.' London: Murray. 1842.

EIGHT years ago, the Author of ' Philip Van Artevelde' stepped forth from 'the sage seclusion, the retreat sacred to letters,' 'unhappily unfrequent in the land,' to take at once his place, no mean one, among the dramatic poets of our country. He stood forward boldly as a reformer of poetical taste, avowing himself a disciple of the elder masters of the drama, and bearing testimony against the Byronian poetry and the 'phantastic school' of Shelley and his followers. His success justified the loftiness of his aim and the freedom of his criticism. The execution of the poem was as skilful as the conception was vigorous. ' Philip Van Artevelde' is 'no shadowy personification, but an historic person, an individualized combination of the real elements of human nature, exhibited in action and progress;'^{*}—'a character of mixed and earthly elements, acting upon events and circumstances which re-act upon the agent, modifying, darkening, tarnishing the intellectual and moral nature, and leaving, at last, the man how altered from his youth!' A new work, therefore, from the same pen, while it challenges public attention on the ground of the Author's deserved reputation, will not be judged of from its intrinsic merit, but by comparison with his former production. The Author must pay the penalty of his success, if this comparison should lead to a somewhat unjust disparagement of a work which, had it been the production of an unknown or inferior author, would have won commendation, and been hailed as the promise of better things. We regret to say, that 'Edwin the Fair' cannot compete with ' Philip Van Artevelde.' As an historical portrait, or rather, as a dramatic conception, the unfortunate Saxon King is very inferior to the Flemish Regent. The plot, which breaks off abruptly, is less interesting, as well as less skilfully managed; scenes and personages being introduced

* Eclectic Review. Vol. XII. (3rd Series.) pp. 251, 264.
VOL. XIII. F F

which, if not out of keeping with the main story, have but a secondary connexion with the course of events. And this is the case, notwithstanding that the Author has ‘not scrupled to borrow from the bordering reigns incidents which were characteristic of the times, and acts which, though really performed by some of the *aramatis personæ*, were not performed by them during that portion of their lives which is included in the reign of Edwin.’

The object of the poem is to delineate the struggle of the monastic orders, ‘in the ascetic and fanatical stage of their existence,’ to grasp supreme power, in opposition alike to the temporal magnates and the secular clergy. The Romish and monachal interest was headed and supported by Dunstan, the far-famed Abbot of Glastonbury, whose odour of sanctity, and fearful combats with the evil one, formed so favourite a theme with the monkish writers. In his character, which is the leading one of the drama, there is an obscurity which Mr. Taylor has not succeeded in clearing up. The Anglo-Saxon saint must have been either a zealous and thorough fanatic, self-deceived, and therefore deceiving the world, or a specious, designing hypocrite, who would have deemed it a superfluous trouble to try to persuade himself that his tortuous course and ambitious aims had for their object to eject Satan with discomfiture from his moral empire in the heart of man. Dunstan could not have been an incongruous mixture of these two opposite characters, as we find him here represented. His soliloquy in Scene 3, is that of a mistaken, but fervent zealot. He then suspends his devout aspirations to establish his creature Gurmo, a thorough-paced villain, in the hollow of a tree, where he is wont to bellow, in the character of Satan, to support the demon-quelling reputation of the saintly hermit. This incongruity excepted, the character of Dunstan is well conceived. His interview with the queen mother, which immediately follows the scene above alluded to, exhibits the wily hypocrite to the life; and as, towards the close of the drama, his power becomes more firmly established, he breaks forth into a display of arrogance and violence of temper worthy of the cowl. The other ecclesiastical characters are natural and well drawn. The conversation of the monks in the corridor of a monastery at Sheen, is a quiet satire upon the idleness of conventional life and the abject servility of the holy monks. The primate, Odo, jealous of his own dignity, yet forced to yield to the mightier spirit of the self-denying abbot, the politic Cumba, ‘so wild and sweet,’ who

‘Betwixt the monks and secular church half-way
Stands smiling upon both;’—

the rabid Morcar and his fiendish brother, Monn, are sketched in our Author's happiest style. As to the unfortunate Edwin, he is represented as possessing 'the spirit of a king, and of a king of England too' (to apply the words of our great Princess); and had he been such as Mr. Taylor has portrayed him, he might have defied monk, abbot, and primate, and have swayed the sceptre of Alfred in spite of the crosier. The light-hearted but faithful and gallant Earl Athulf is own brother to our earlier acquaintance, Sir Walter D'Arlon; and his engagement to the king's sister reminds us of the suit of Clara Van Artevelde, who is not very unlike the royal Saxon maiden. Wulfstan the Wise is a more original character, and admirably sustained; a Saxon Nestor, whose *copia verborum* is redolent of practical wisdom, though at times, as is natural, bordering on the garrulous. Emma, his daughter, spirited and fearless, is a pleasing character; although we cannot admire her feint of being married to a poor simple youth, with a view to secure to herself an equivocal protection in her mission. But the strongest interest is inspired by the noble Leolf, who had been promised the hand of the heroine, Elgiva, by her brother, and finds himself supplanted by a younger and royal lover; yet, instead of reproaching, he thus extenuates her fault:—

LEOLF.

'Reproach her not; she is a child in years,
And though in wit a woman, yet her heart,
Untempered by the discipline of pain,
Is fancy-led. One half the fault was mine.
She is a child; and, look—upon my head
Already peepeth out the willowy grey.
My youth is wearing from me.'

ATHULF.

Nay, not so.

LEOLF.

'And youth and sovereignty, with furtherance fair
Of a seductive beauty in the boy,
What could they but prevail!'

* * * * *

Quit we the theme.

'But from my griefs and me this counsel take:
Expend the passion of thy heart in youth;
Fight thy love-battles whilst thy heart is strong,
And wounds heal kindly. An April frost
Is sharp, but kills not: sad October's storm
Strikes when the juices and the vital sap
Are ebbing from the leaf. No more!'—pp. 52—54.

We must add the soliloquy of the gallant '*heretoch*,' or com-

mander, when he seeks, in his ancestral towers, the ‘companionable music of the sea.’

‘*The Sea-shore, near Hastings.*

LEOLF, alone.

LEOLF.

‘Rocks that beheld my boyhood! Perilous shelf
That nursed my infant courage! Once again
I stand before you—not, as in other days,
In your gray faces smiling, but, like you,
The worse for weather. Here again I stand,
Again and on the solitary shore
Old ocean plays as on an instrument,
Making that ancient music, when not known?
That ancient music only not so old
As He who parted ocean from dry land
And saw that it was good. Upon my ear,
As in the season of susceptive youth,
The mellow murmur falls; but finds the sense
Dulled by distemper; shall I say—by time?
Enough in action has my life been spent
Through the past decade, to rebate the edge
Of early sensibility. The sun
Rides high, and on the thoroughfares of life
I find myself a man in middle age,
Busy and hard to please. The sun shall soon
Dip westerly; but oh! how little like
Are life’s two twilights! Would the last were first
And the first last! that so we might be soothed
Upon the thoroughfares of busy life
Beneath the noonday sun, with hope of joy
Fresh as the morn,—with hope of breaking lights,
Illuminated mists and spangled lawns
And woodland orisons and unfolding flowers,
As things in expectation.’—pp. 73, 74.

Elgiva, the lovely and unhappy victim of monkish machinations, the reader will feel unable to blame, or to suspect of having trifled with the heart of her early suitor. We must let her speak for herself in the following beautiful scene:—

EDWIN.

‘We are alone, Elgiva;
Oh, how I hate my title in your mouth.
Rather than speak as in the audience-chamber,
Let us be children once again, to rove
O’er hill, through vale, with interlacing arms,
And thrid the thickets where wild roses grow
Entangled with each other like ourselves.

Can you, and will you, those sweet days remember,
And strive to bring them back?

ELGIVA.

Those days—Oh, Edwin! . . .
Can I remember? When can I forget them?
When flowers forget to blow and birds to sing,
And clouds to kindle in the May-day dawn,
And every spring-tide sight and sound shall cease,
Or cease for me, then too for me shall cease
The sweet remembrance of the tender joys,
The smiles, the tears of those delightful days.

EDWIN.

And can they not repeat themselves? Again
Let us, though grown, be children in our hearts.
Then with the freedom and the innocence
Which led our childish steps we'll wander on
Through after life, but with a fuller joy.
Let recollections of the past, if sweet,
Plead sweetly for the present.

ELGIVA.

Edwin, Edwin!

You are a king.

EDWIN.

Now, see! I've summoned up,
Like a magician whose strong spell evokes
A beautiful spirit, the spirit of the past,
And bid it speak, and prophesy, and plead;
And, lo! it nothing answers but the words
The Herald spake, when o'er my father's grave
He brake his wand of office. I am a King,
But may not Kings be happy? May Kings not love?
* * * * *

Beloved Elgiva,

Thy beauty o'er the earth a passion breathes
Which softly sweeping through me, brings one tone
From all this plural being, as the wind
From yonder sycamore, whose thousand leaves,
With lavish play to one soft music moved,
Tremble and sigh together.

ELGIVA.

What a charm

The neighbouring grove to this lone chamber lends!
I've loved it from my childhood. How long since
Is it that standing in this compass'd window
The blackbird sang us forth; from yonder bough
That hides the arbour, loud and full at first
Warbling his invitations, then with pause

And fraction, fitfully as evening fell,
 The while the rooks, a spotty multitude,
 Far distant crept across the amber sky.
 But hark! what strain is this? No blackbird's song,
 Nor sighing of the sycamore!

EDWIN.

Some friend,
 As if the key-note of our hearts divining,
 Accordant music ministers. Hist! Hist!—pp. 33—37.

These extracts will, we hope, sufficiently answer the purpose of shewing that the poetry of this drama is of a high order. We owe an apology to Mr. Taylor for having so long delayed this brief notice of his volume, but he must attribute it to our reluctance to speak with modified praise of a work which, as coming from his pen, we opened with, perhaps, too highly raised expectations, hoping to have renewed the powerful interest created by his *Philip Van Artevelde* and *Adriana*. The pleasing impressions left by his former work, if not reproduced, have not been displaced.

Art. V. Apostolical Christianity; or, the People's Antidote against Romanism and Puseyism. By the Rev. James Godkin, author of a 'Guide from the Church of Rome to the Church of Christ.' Svo. London: John Snow, Paternoster-row.

To every attentive observer of the 'Signs of the Times,' it is obvious that Romanism has, of late, acquired great apparent vigour, and that the partisans of Romanism are bestirring themselves with unwonted activity and zeal for the support and propagation of their principles. They do not consider it sufficient to stand on the defensive, and labour to repel attacks made on their system by the friends of truth; but, as if feeling that now or never is the time to rouse to effort for the safety of their church and the spread of their sentiments, and that merely standing on the defensive will avail little, they have become actively aggressive, and are ready to compass both sea and land, and employ all means, foul and fair, to make proselytes to their sect. Nor need we be surprised at this recent renewal of zeal in the bosom of the Romish church. The progress of society, and the spirit of the age, are opposed to everything intolerant, and which rests merely on authority. Liberty, civil and religious, is the darling theme of men of all classes and all creeds. The spirit of inquiry is abroad. All systems, however venerable, whether they be systems of politics or religion, are about to be subjected, and indeed, are now in the act of being subjected to a process of

sifting investigation. It will not avail the abettors of these systems to urge authority, or to plead prescription. In vain do they vociferate 'Hear the church.' Argument, or at least, the semblance of argument, must be produced to satisfy the cravings of awakening mind—Rome knows this, Rome feels this; and, therefore, she is up and full of energy. Could inquiry be quashed, could the progress of enlightenment be stayed, could the yoke of authority be imposed on Christendom, or could the power of the sword, or the terror of the fire and the rack, be exerted with unrestrained freedom—then indeed, Rome might sit secure, and scorn to reason with those she could so easily crush. But as she can hope for no such things, as the course of society, enlightenment, inquiry, freedom, is onward, her only policy is to adapt herself to the circumstances in which she is placed, and, by appearing as the friend of inquiry, and by employing argument, aim to support her interests and extend her sway. Rome too, is conscious that in periods gone by, she has *lost*, and is now anxious to retrieve her loss; nor should we be surprised if, in some cases, she obtains success. To us it appears quite natural. Nor are we alarmed—Why should we? The struggle is between truth and error; and if, in this struggle, error should sometimes obtain an advantage, yet we know that truth *must* and *will* eventually prevail.

And of what, after all, has Rome to boast? In France the principles of the Reformation are gaining ground. A wide door of usefulness is open there to evangelical labourers. In Spain, the political power of the Pope has been disclaimed, monasteries have been destroyed, and the priests are held in little respect; while, as a missionary from Spain informs us, the *people* seem generally disposed to listen to the preaching of the gospel. In Italy itself, the authority of the Pope is so little regarded that Mennais, in his 'Affaires de Rome,' avers,—and Mennais is a Roman-catholic writer,—'Rome knows it, the pontifical authority has, for a long time, had nowhere less influence than in Italy. . . . Not only do they, (the Italians,) not believe in it, but they repel it with a lively animosity; they hate it with an implacable hatred, as the principal cause of the evils of the country. It is distressing to speak thus; but in the state of things one ought not to conceal any truth. Let Italy then, be, for one single day, left to herself; let the existing order have no other support than the admonitions of the head of the church, his prohibitions and his commandments, the next day the revolution would extend from Turin to the extremity of Calabria.'

In England, it is true, in protestant England, Rome is meeting with some success. Here she has been able to make proselytes to her creed from among the upper, middle, and lower classes of

society. This, we should think, is mainly attributable to the previously existing Anglo-Romanism of the Anglo-catholic church. Under the influence of this, we might expect to see many, already disposed towards Romanism, becoming, when the path of consistency is shown them, full-grown Romanists. The Puseyite movement is the joy of the Romish church ; without this, Rome would have but little footing in England ; and hence, the hope of Romanism in Britain, lies within the bosom of the Anglican church.

On Ireland, Romanism has, no doubt, a firm hold. The Irish are, truly, a religious people ; infidelity has, at least among the humbler classes, no influence upon them ; they would avoid an infidel as they would a fiend, but to their church they are firmly attached. Protestantism has made very little impression upon them ; they regard the efforts of protestant ministers with suspicion ; they give *such* but little credit for sincerity in their professions of love for the souls of Irishmen ; their own church they consider as a poor and persecuted church, while they regard protestantism as a persecutor. And who, that reads the history of Ireland, however grieved he may be, can be astonished at this ? They have generally seen professing, but misnamed protestantism, going hand in hand with oppression, spoliation, and misrule. The church of England was established among them by force, and has always appeared in their midst, instead of a herald of peace and a dispenser of blessings, as a collector of taxes, an oppressor of conscience, and an author of discord. With this church the Irishman usually connects, in his thoughts, the injustice of the tythe proctor, the bayonet of the policeman, and the poverty, tears, and even blood, of his kinsfolk and acquaintance. The cruel persecutions which Ireland has suffered from the avowed abettors of protestantism, the penal laws which have pressed, like some mighty incubus, on the energies of the country, and the degraded position the Irish Romanist has been compelled to take,—all these things have only tended to steel the hearts of Irish Romanists against the truth, as dispensed by protestants, and to attach them with a fonder and stronger affection to their church. Just as the storm, which overthrows stronger obstacles to its progress, and lays them prostrate on the earth, only causes the trembling ivy to entwine itself round the oak with a firmer grasp.

Another circumstance which has tended materially to retard the spread of protestantism in Ireland, is the *unkind spirit* which protestant controversialists have too generally displayed towards Roman catholics. Instead of assuming the tones of conciliation, and treating deeply fixed and easily roused prejudices with that tenderness which a sound knowledge of human nature, or even

of their own hearts, would have dictated, they have, too commonly, indulged in bitter declamation, unkind invective, and unsparing abuse. They have acted so contrary to what they should, that if they had been hired by Rome for the purpose, they could scarcely have more effectually opposed the progress of truth. Add to this, that they have been the avowed, or at least well known, enemies of the political rights of the Irish Romanist. And this holds true, with some honourable exceptions, of dissenters as well as of the adherents of the established church; hence, as might have been anticipated, the success of such, otherwise accomplished advocates of the truth, has proved miserably small.

It is but just, however, to observe, that a change for the better has come over Ireland—old prejudices are giving way, a spirit of inquiry is pervading the masses of the people, education and illumination are making progress, and the yoke of priestly domination and tyranny is gradually, but certainly, falling from the neck of the once thoroughly priest-ridden Romanist. If asked the cause of this pleasing change, we would reply, it is the result, in part, of political and religious agitation, leading the people to *think*, on all subjects, for themselves; in part, of the bold and noble assertion of the principles of civil and religious liberty, constantly made from the platform and the press by Roman-catholic agitators: in part, of the establishment of schools in numerous districts of the country, where none existed before; in part, of the increasing intercourse between Roman-catholics and protestants, joined with the fact that greater numbers of the latter than could be counted in former times, have, in these latter years, avowed themselves as the advocates of the political rights of the Irish Romanist; and, finally, in part, from the recent remarkable and unprecedented spread of temperance among the working classes. The Irish priest, though sincerely loved, has not the same despotic authority over the mind of his flock which he could once exert; and this, we believe is, in a great measure, to be attributed to Roman-catholic priests and agitators themselves. The people, appealed to, on all political subjects, are beginning to be *conscious* that they have minds, and to feel that they have a *right* to exercise their minds on every subject; and having been once brought to this state, they are not likely again, quietly, to submit to any over despotic exercise of spiritual authority. Let then the Roman-catholics of Ireland be approached in the spirit of wisdom, and dealt with in the spirit of love, and who can say what may be the happy result? It is pleasing to add, that there are men prepared so to act towards them; men whose spirit is mild, whose manner is full of candour and honesty, and whose political views are avowedly liberal. Among these Mr. Godkin, whose book stands at the head of this

article, holds the foremost place. Many pious persons in Ireland, who have been altogether opposed to controversial lectures against Romanism, because of the unchristian spirit which too often pervades them, have, on hearing Mr. Godkin, been obliged to acknowledge, (contrary to their previous convictions,) that controversy 'may be conducted in a Christian manner,' without acrimony and abuse. We hail, therefore, the appearance of another work from the pen of Mr. Godkin, on the Romish controversy—a subject on which he is so competent to write. To use his own words:—'He is no raw recruit in this warfare. He was brought up in camps, and has been for several years engaged in active service. He has tried his weapons, and found them proof in every species of conflict, whether wielded from the press, the pulpit, or the platform.' The truth of this we can attest from our own knowledge. Having been brought up a Roman-catholic, and being withal a man of deep thought and acute observation, he is well acquainted with the 'inner form' and essence, as well as with the outward bearings of the system whose unsoundness he has discovered, and which truth, long since, obliged him to forsake.

His acquaintance with Romanism qualifies him, of course, equally well, for writing against Puseyism, which we are compelled to regard, not as a different system from Romanism, but as, in all its leading features, essentially the same. If Romanism be the opposite to Protestantism, and if the great principles of the latter be the sole and supreme authority of the written, inspired word, in all questions of faith, discipline, and morals,—and the right of every man to exercise his mind in judging of the meaning of the Spirit in the revelation he has given us, uncontrolled by human dictation,—then, surely, Puseyism is radically and essentially Romanism. It may differ in some things from Popery, it may be free from the grosser elements and more obnoxious external forms of the papal system, it may even have been in existence, in some of its principles, before the Romish system was fully matured; but that is false delicacy only, and not simple justice, which would keep us from averring that it is essentially the same. While, therefore, it is convenient for the sake of explicitness and for argumentative purposes, to distinguish the systems by different names, we must never forget, that they are of kindred origin and nature. Let popery be destroyed, and Puseyism will perish along with it; or, let Puseyism be overthrown, and popery is no more.

Mr. Godkin's book is an admirable 'antidote' against both these systems; and is peculiarly fitted to be the '*people's* antidote,' not indeed, because it is not learned and fundamental, for this is by no means the case; but because it is written in a style

so simple and lucid, that it is comprehensible by all. There is much learning in it, or rather, we should say, there are the *results* of much learning and research, admirably condensed and popularised. It goes thoroughly into each question it discusses, and brings to bear upon all a large amount of powerful argumentation; producing, in most cases, full satisfaction in the mind of the reader. If the stream of argument and illustration throughout runs clearly, this is not because it is shallow, but because it is beautifully transparent. The style of the work is simple and chaste, perfectly free from affectation, false ornament, and turgid declamation, which passes with some for eloquence. Here and there will be found passages of surpassing beauty. On the whole, we have seen no work, amid the many which have issued from the press on the same controversy, better, and few so well calculated, to vindicate protestant truth, and to expose and refute Italian and Anglican popery.

The book is divided into twenty-three chapters, with the following titles:—‘Introduction,’ ‘The Chair of Peter,’ ‘Rise of the Papal Supremacy,’ ‘Reign of the Papacy,’ ‘Apostolical Succession,’ ‘The People’s right to choose their own Pastors,’ ‘Scriptural Bishops and Catholic Prelates,’ ‘On Hearing the Church,’ ‘General Councils,’ ‘The Keys and the Confessional,’ ‘The Predicted Apostasy,’ ‘Celibacy and Monachism,’ ‘Claims of the Ancient Fathers,’ ‘Sketch of the History of the Church,’ ‘Baptismal Regeneration,’ ‘The Real Presence and Transubstantiation,’ ‘The Mass, or Eucharistic Sacrifice,’ ‘Mediation of Christ, and Invocation of Saints,’ ‘State of the Dead,’ ‘Purgatory,’ ‘The Use of Images in Worship,’ ‘The Christian Sabbath,’ ‘Infant Baptism and the Procession of the Holy Ghost,’ ‘Faith and Works,’ ‘Conclusion.’ It will be seen from this enumeration, that the work is very comprehensive. Instead, however, of advising Mr. Godkin to diminish aught from his book, our advice would be to add a few chapters more on the sole authority of the Bible, tradition, and the right of private judgment. We would also suggest a different arrangement of the work. Let the introduction stand by itself unnumbered; let the predicted apostasy and the following two chapters form the first three; let the second to the tenth chapters, inclusive, come next; then the fifteenth to the twentieth; then the twenty-second; then the twenty-first; then the fourteenth; and then the twenty-third, forming the conclusion. Such an altered arrangement would, we conceive, be an improvement to the book.

If we were disposed to find fault with any chapter, it would be with that on ‘Baptismal Regeneration;’ not that Mr. Godkin is not orthodox on the point, but because the subject does

not appear to be discussed with his usual ability ; still we admit it is excellent. In page 265, our author speaks *as if* baptism and regeneration were sometimes ‘ confounded’ together in Scripture, as are the ‘ sign and the thing signified’ in common speech ; but surely this is not so. The term regeneration is never applied to water-baptism—water-baptism is never called regeneration. We read of the ‘ washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,’ but it is manifest that the ‘ washing of regeneration’ denotes the *commencement* of the great moral change which is carried forward by the ‘ renewing of the Holy Ghost.’

In page 267 we read, ‘ It is true, Paul was called on at his conversion to ‘ arise and wash away his sins,’ but that was plainly in an emblematical and ceremonial sense,’ &c. Here Mr. Godkin obviously takes the command, ‘ wash away thy sins,’ to refer to baptism, and therefore he takes it in an emblematical sense. But such is not the meaning of Ananias. ‘ Arise and wash away thy sins ;’ but how ? namely, by ‘ calling on the name of the Lord.’ See Rom. x. 13.

While pointing out these (as we conceive) errors, we shall take occasion to refer to a few more. In page 25, our author says, ‘ the highest power of the keys is that of forgiving or retaining sin.’ We think not. The two things are, in our view, totally distinct. The one is authority to open the kingdom of heaven ; the other,—namely, the power of remitting and retaining sin, is authority to declare infallibly and by inspiration, the terms of forgiveness and the grounds of condemnation. We cannot admit, with *Lightfoot*, that the latter has reference to the infliction of diseases on offenders, and the removal of such diseases in case of repentance.

On the same page the writer asserts that the power of the keys was conferred on *all* the apostles. We ask, when and where ? We are of opinion that this promise, ‘ I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ was made exclusively to Peter, and was actually fulfilled in his ministry ; for he it was whom God employed to open the door of the kingdom to both Jews and Gentiles,—to the former on the day of Pentecost, to the latter when he was called to visit Cornelius. Once opened, we may observe, it needed not to be opened again.* On page 95, Mr. Godkin expresses his uncertainty as to whether the apostles had the sanction of their Master in the election of Mathias. We know it is very common to say they had not ; but we demand why ? Had they not received the Holy Spirit? John xx. 22. But on this point we have not room to dwell.

In page 126, Mr. Godkin falls into a curious misquotation.

* See *Lightfoot*.

'The righteous man falleth seven times *a day*.' Prov. xxiv. 16.
'A day' is an addition which we have frequently met with in theological writings, but for which we are altogether unable to account, as it is found neither in the authorized version, the Douay, the Latin Vulgate, the Septuagint, nor the Hebrew.

In page 372, our author says, 'Pliny testifies that the Christians met to worship Christ as God on the *first* day of the week. This is an error. Pliny's words are '*stato die*.' True, the *stated* day was the first of the week.

We marked down these and a few other trifling errors, not for the sake of finding fault, but to point them out for correction. They are so trifling, that we were disposed to pass them by without noticing them, but this would not be just to the author. We shall now furnish our readers with a brief extract or two, remarking, that no extract can give an adequate idea of the work, and that we hope all our readers will possess themselves of it as a volume which will largely contribute to their gratification and instruction in the truth. The following extracts are from the chapter on 'Apostolical Succession':—

'If Rome possessed apostolic power at the Reformation, as the Anglicans contend, and if all bishops derived their authority from the pope as the vicar of Jesus Christ, how could a small minority of those bishops, living in England, revolt against their head without being guilty of *schism* and spiritual rebellion?

'If they were guilty of that crime, have they not been ever since, not only '*abandoned*' by their mother, but shut out of the pale of the Catholic church, whose unity they had wickedly broken?

'Was it not *in obedience* to Henry VIII., a licentious, secular tyrant, that the English church renounced the authority of her Roman mother? and is it not a fact that she was a tool of the civil power; that the number of these priests who kept a conscience in the reigns of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, never amounted to two hundred? All the rest tamely conformed, the colour of their creed changing as fast as the chameleon's, according to the light that shone upon it from the court. They did not refuse to bow down to the ever-changing idols, which the temporal sovereign chanced to set up.

'But what becomes of all the wonderful virtue which, as we have seen, high-churchmen ascribe to the succession, if the very power to whom it was committed by apostolic hands, and by whom it is transmitted to others, could, after all, '*set up idols*,' and such idols as even the Anglican hierarchy had too much conscience to worship? How comes it to pass that the most apostolic church in Christendom is also the *most idolatrous*?

'Contrary to the nature of all holy things, this mystical power seems to be moved by a strong propensity to ally itself with corruption. It delights to brood, like the sea-bird, on agitated waters, that cast up weeds and mire; and, as if endowed with a charmed life, it survives

in a perpetual pestilence where every other heavenly grace is sure to perish ! Forsaking the bright abodes of the virtuous and the free, it selects as its chosen, its eternal home, the darkest city, the vilest court, the bloodiest throne in Europe.'—pp. 60, 61.

Again :—

'Indeed it is utterly impossible that the apostles could have *successors*. With nearly as much reason might you say, that our blessed Saviour had successors in the work of redemption. The apostles did a work which *could not be repeated*. They *revealed* the gospel—that cannot be done again. They opened the 'door of faith to the Gentiles'—that requires no second hand to touch it; it stands open for ever. They laid the foundation of the church—that foundation can never be moved. There cannot be a succession of founders any more than a succession of inventors—'other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid' by the 'wise master builders.' The Romans and Anglicans have indeed laid another, but *theirs* does not support the church of Christ, it only supports their own, a building I would not like to live in, when the storm comes and the floods rise.'—p. 66.

The whole chapter on the Succession is admirable. If space permitted, we would present our readers with some passages from that headed, 'A Sketch of the Church of Christ ;' but we strongly recommend it to their attentive perusal, as giving a beautifully scriptural view of the true church. It is admirably written.

The following passage will give the reader an idea of Mr. Godkin's style ; it is on the Lord's supper :—

'The loveliness of pure and undefiled religion 'needs not the foreign aid of ornament.' Of all the forms of Christianity, none is so sublimely simple, or fraught with such interesting associations, as the Lord's Supper. In the night in which he was betrayed, JESUS, surrounded by his disciples in a private room, took bread and broke it, also wine, and poured it out, and having given thanks to his Father, gave them to his disciples, saying, 'DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.' This was his memorial. Here he erected a monument to perpetuate his name. There was no sounding of trumpets, no military rejoicings on this occasion, no master of eloquence pronounced an oration, no poet recited his ode of immortal praise, no royal declaration sanctioned the birth of this holy institute, nor did the great and noble congregate to witness its establishment. To the philosopher, the poet, the historian, the statesman, nothing could appear more mean and insignificant than this last supper. If they deigned to consider it for a moment, they would regard it merely as the unmeaning act of a few illiterate enthusiasts—a mere bubble on the mighty stream of national events. Could they have dreamed that it was the emblem of a power which should *revolutionize* the world!—that after the lapse of nearly two thousand years of changes and of national disasters,—of falling empires and rising commonwealths,—of wars, convulsions, and

desolations,—of revolutions in science, in literature, in religion, in national manners, in commerce, in all sorts of opinions,—THIS ORDINANCE should be found existing still in primitive purity and simplicity, diffused over the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, flourishing even in a world unknown to ancient Rome, still fresh in its beauty, undimmed in its lustre; unmaimed in its power, borne on the billows of every sea, penetrating the gloom of every wilderness, and finding a lodgement in the heart of every savage tribe. Nor is it wrapt in the clouds of tradition, of uncertain origin, and doubtful aim. Children need not ask their parents, ‘What mean ye by this?’ It is surrounded by the light of authentic history; and, like a luminous cross in the firmament, proclaims to all nations, and all ages, that JESUS DIED TO REDEEM the world, and will come again to be its JUDGE. The memories of those who built the Pyramids are perished ; cities bearing imperial names are buried in ruins: monuments of brass and marble have yielded to the ‘canker tooth of time,’ and been faithless to their trust. ‘Decay’s effacing fingers’ have obliterated the features of ancient greatness from the worn-out canvass; but this representative memorial still lives to tell its thrilling story of love, and power, and peace. What name so well known as the name of JESUS! ‘His name shall endure for ever; His name shall be continued as long as the sun, and men shall be blessed in Him : all nations shall call Him blessed’ and blessed be His glorious name for ever! and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen and Amen.’—pp. 315, 316.

The whole chapter, of which this beautiful paragraph forms the close, contains the most eloquent argument we have ever read against the sacrifice of the Mass. We recommend it to our readers’ special attention, along with that on transubstantiation.

Mr. Godkin, in treating of transubstantiation, denies that the words, ‘this is my body,’ even if taken *literally*, can denote ‘a change of the bread into the substance of our Saviour’s body.’ The verb *to be*, he maintains, never signifies a change. When a change is to be expressed, another word is always employed. When one thing is said to be *another*, the language is *always figurative*. These positions, within which Mr. Godkin entrenches himself, form a bulwark of strength from which the enemies of the truth will, in vain, endeavour to dislodge him.

But while we are fully satisfied with the completeness and conclusiveness of the argument, we are not sure but that Mr. Godkin has fallen into an error. The verb *to be*, he says, never denotes a change. When this idea is to be conveyed, another word is always employed. To prove this, he adduces various examples. Among these is the transubstantiation of Moses’ rod into a serpent, where the Hebrew *substantive verb* קָרַב is employed. Now קָרַב corresponds with the English verb

to be, and is commonly used as a copula to connect the subject with the predicate, as in the examples: ‘the serpent *was* more subtle than any beast of the field,’ ‘Abraham *was* ninety years old and nine,’ ‘the earth *was* without form and void.’ It is true that the Hebrew has another verb, which signifies *to be*; we mean שׁ; but this is frequently used as a substitute for הָיָה; and the force of both, we think, is the same. Both denote *existence*. Now in asserting that the verb *to be* never denotes a change, and yet adducing הָיָה as denoting a change, Mr. Godkin appears to contradict himself. We are of opinion that הָיָה, *by itself*, is never used to signify the change of one thing into another. We know Gesenius assigns to it as one of its meanings, *to become*, but let his examples be rigidly examined, and we are bold to affirm that none of them will be found to bear out his position; or even should the Hebrew word have this meaning, in some places, in none will it be found to signify, *by itself*, the change of one thing into another. The only example* we know of in which the word *seems* to denote such a change, is in the 19th of Genesis, in relation to Lot’s wife. But there is no transubstantiation here. The language is figurative—just as figurative as the words, ‘that rock was Christ’—‘she was, or existed, a pillar of salt’—an *everlasting monument* of the sin of disobedience. (See Numbers, xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5; Amer. Bib. Repos. Vol. iii., N.S., p. 344; A. Clark’s Commentary.) When the idea of change is intended to be conveyed, the construction is the substantive verb הָיָה, followed by the preposition לְ. ‘This,’ says Professor Stuart (Heb. Gram. p. 204, ed. 5), ‘is the habitual construction’ in such a case. Thus God breathed into man’s nostrils the breath of life, וַיֹּאמֶר לְנַפְשׁוֹ חַיָּה, ‘and he became a living soul.’ So in the case of Moses, he cast his rod upon the ground, וַיַּעֲשֵׂה לְנַחַשׁ, ‘and it became a serpent.’ (Gen. ii. 7; Exodus, iv.)

While, therefore, we differ a little with Mr. Godkin in the mode of arriving at the conclusion, that the verb *to be* never denotes a change: in the conclusion itself we fully acquiesce, as well as in the necessary consequence, that the words, ‘this is my body,’ even should they be taken *literally*, do not, and can not convey the idea of a transubstantiation.

* There is another apparent example; but we conceive it is only apparent. Exod. vii. 19. The Lord said to Moses, ‘Take thy rod, and stretch out thy hand over the waters of Egypt,’ &c., וְעַל מִזְבֵּחַ, and there shall be, or that there may be, blood. True, the verb is plural; but the noun, though singular in form, is a collective, and may have a verb singular or plural in concord with it. The Septuagint rendering is καὶ ἐσταὶ αἷμα, which is more correct than the authorized version.

But we must hasten to a close. We have read the book with great satisfaction. It is a valuable accession to our stores of polemical theology, as well for the mildness and tone of spirituality which pervade it, as for the clearness and power of its reasoning. It deserves a high place among our standard works on controversial divinity. The 'Guide' is a deservedly popular work, but *this* is of a very superior order. We hope, therefore, indeed we are sure, that it will have an extensive and rapid sale, and that speedily we shall have to record the appearance of a second and enlarged edition.

Art. VI. *A Popular History of British India, Commercial Intercourse with China, and the Insular Possessions of England in the Eastern Seas.* By W. Cooke Taylor, LL.D., &c. London: Madden and Co.

THIS is a very seasonable, useful, and judiciously executed publication. At the very moment when the interest attaching to British India—owing to various circumstances, but more particularly to the Affghan and Chinese wars, in which this country has been so lately and fearfully engaged—was perhaps never more profoundly felt; every person, and more especially every young person, partaking of this natural feeling, will hail with thankfulness and delight, such a convenient manual of its history as the present, brought down, moreover, to a very recent date, namely, the middle of the year 1842. And the more valuable we regard it in many respects, inasmuch as it is a simple narrative of facts, derived for the most part, as the author tells us, from the best authorities, in which he introduces few or no opinions of his own, but leaves his readers to form their own reflections and deduce their own conclusions. We are also informed that it is intended, in the successive editions of the work, to bring down the history of our Indian empire to the latest period. Of course a succinct account of the recent proceedings in Affghanistan finds a fitting place in this volume, extended to the forcing of the Khyber Pass by General Pollock, the landing of Lord Ellenborough at Calcutta, and the death of Shah Sooja. Subjoined is a narrative of British intercourse with China, and of our late conquests and proceedings in that country down to the capture of Ningpo and of Chapoo on the 18th of May, 1842.

Possessing, as we do, the very profound, philosophical, and voluminous work of the late Mr. Mill, recently so ably edited by Professor Wilson, of Oxford, and already in part, the somewhat more popularly written, and we believe correct and faithful, though still extensive and discursive, history of India by Mr.

Elphinstone, there would yet seem to be room for a more concise, popular, and matter-of-fact account of our Eastern territories than any hitherto extant, and the present volume is well calculated to fill up the void. The task of its compilation required a discriminating judgment, a niceness in the selection and classification of facts, and peculiar powers of condensation in the narration, all which qualifications Dr. Taylor evidently possesses. For this purpose there was no occasion for the author to have previously resided in India; though some persons are of opinion, (an absurd one we think,) that no one can adequately describe the annals of that country, without an intimate personal acquaintance with it, as well as a knowledge of the Oriental languages. Whether Dr. Taylor is possessed of either or both of these accidental qualifications we are not aware, but we venture to maintain there is no real necessity that he should be. Mr. Mill had never been in India, and yet he produced an original history, which, for general utility, fidelity, and philosophic acumen, has never been surpassed. Much less necessary is it, then, we should apprehend, that the writer of a work such as the one now before us, should be in the enjoyment of this doubtful advantage. Robertson was never in America, though he composed its history; nor in Germany or Spain, though he wrote the history of Charles the Fifth; nay, it is said that he did not even know the German language. Tacitus was never in Germany, nor acquainted with the language of the Teutonic race, and yet he wrote a treatise on the manners of the Germans, a composition generally admired for the fidelity and exactness with which it is executed, though some have declared that he delineated manners and customs which never existed. Many other instances of the like kind, both from ancient and modern times, might be adduced if it were requisite. ‘I have no doubt of being able to make out, to the satisfaction of all reflecting minds,’ says Mr. Mill, ‘that the man who should bring to the composition of a history of India, the qualifications alone which can be acquired in Europe, would come, in an almost infinite degree, better fitted for the task, than the man who should bring to it the qualifications alone which can be acquired in India; and that the business of acquiring the one set of qualifications is almost wholly incompatible with that of acquiring the other. For, let us inquire what it is that a man can learn, by going to India, and understanding its languages. He can treasure up the facts which are presented to his senses; he can learn the facts which are recorded in such native books as have not been translated; and he can ascertain facts by conversation with the natives, which have never yet been committed to writing. This he can do; and I am not aware that he can do anything further.’ He

goes on at considerable length to prove, and we think very successfully so, that the man best qualified for dealing with evidence, is the man best qualified for writing (and may we not say epitomising?) the history of India; that the habits which are subservient to the successful exploration of evidence are more likely to be acquired in Europe than in India; and that the mental habits which are acquired in mere observing, and in the acquisition of languages, are almost as different as any mental habits can be, from the powers of combination, discrimination, classification, philosophising in short, which are the powers of most importance for extracting the precious ore from a great mine of historical materials.

If these remarks should appear to the reader a digression, having little, or but a doubtful, relevancy to the subject in hand, or admittedly, (from our previous observations) to the compiler of the work before us, our apology is, the desire of an opportunity, however incidental, to meet the somewhat prevailing opinion relative to this topic, and which has exhibited itself more prominently than ever, since the publication of the first part of Mr. Elphinstone's history, (though we hint no disparagement to that able work,) and to put our own sentiments on record; at the same time we cannot but express our perfect acquiescence in the frank admission of Mr. Mill, that, 'as some knowledge may be acquired by seeing India, which cannot be acquired without it; and, as it can be pronounced of hardly any portion of knowledge that it is altogether useless, we will not go so far as to deny, that a man would possess advantages, who, to all the qualifications for writing a history of India which it is possible to acquire in Europe, should add those qualifications which can be acquired only by seeing the country and conversing with its people.'

From the earliest times, India has been regarded as one of the countries most highly favoured, both by nature and art; and, though but imperfectly known to the Greeks and other western nations, they imported some of its choicest and costliest productions, such as its silks, diamonds, and aromatics. In the middle ages, the ports of Egypt and the Red Sea served to facilitate an extensive intercourse with India, which the merchants of Europe, and more particularly of Venice, found themselves called upon and were anxious to maintain; and the precious products thus imported from it into the western regions confirmed the popular opinion of its high refinement and its vast wealth. The discovery by Vasco di Gama, of a passage to India by the Cape of Good Hope, tended still further to strengthen these ideas; and the fleets and armies of the maritime states of Europe were soon enlisted in the grand contest for procuring to their respective nations the dominion of the Asiatic seas, and the commerce of

the country. The Portuguese and the Dutch were the first successful competitors for these beneficial objects. Subsequently, the English and the French obtained a secure footing in India, and established factories on its coasts for the reception and the warehousing of merchandise. By degrees these were converted into military posts, and, in process of time, those two European powers became rivals in the struggle for the more exclusive advantages of the commerce and conquest of the country. The contest eventually terminated in the triumph of the arms of Great Britain, who extended her power on every side, and gradually rose to greatness and dominion, while France lost her pre-eminence on the continent of India. By this vast enlargement of the British power in the East, the way into the interior has been opened, and its territories more deeply and intimately explored. Our knowledge of this distant region has become, in consequence, greatly augmented; and if more accurate inquiry has brought us nearer to the truth with respect to its physical character and resources, and put aside the marvellous stories of the glory and greatness of India—the seat of industry, of commerce and the arts during the era of European barbarism, the theatre of many eventful revolutions, anterior to its conquest by Britain, and the abode of a people of singular manners, institutions, religion, and laws—it yet presents, notwithstanding the effects which British intercourse and influence have wrought upon it, a wide and fruitful field for interesting inquiry and speculation; nay, these very effects are become an attractive theme of further investigation.

Dr. Taylor commences his volume with the early history of Hindustan, and in this we think he departs ‘somewhat from his text,’ for it must be recollectcd that his is professedly a history of *British India*, and not of India in general. The same may be said of the four succeeding chapters, which treat of the Affghan and Mongolian conquests of India, the Empire of Delhi, Early Intercourse between Europe and India, and Sketch of the History of the Portuguese Empire in India. It is not till we arrive at the sixth chapter that we find any mention of the intercourse between Great Britain and India, which expressly treats on the commencement of that intercourse. Here, then, we take it, is the point where his history ought, *consistently*, to have opened, and the date at which Mr. Mill's account does begin.* Few

* It is true that in his second book, Mr. Mill treats of the chronology and ancient history of the Hindus, the classification and distribution of the people, the form of government, the laws, religion, etc.; but we think the discussion of these matters might have been spared, without any detriment, in a work designed as a popular compendium of the history of *British India*.

nations, as Dr. Taylor justly remarks, are more deficient in authentic records of their antiquity than the Hindûs; instead of histories, they possess only vague traditions, exaggerated by the imagination of their poets, and monumental remains which, while they attest by their stupendous size, the taste and magnificence of their founders, afford no certain information as to the time when their builders existed. The principal native authorities for the early annals of Hindustan, are the eighteen Puranas, and the two great epic poems called the Ramayana and Mahabharat. But these are of traditional origin, and of a fabulous character. Some histories of Kashmir, written in the eleventh and twelfth centuries of our era, throw some light on the antiquities of India; and more accurate information respecting the state of the country during a few centuries preceding the Christian era, may be obtained from the Greek writers, as Herodotus, Strabo, Arrian, and others, most of whom obtained some knowledge of these distant regions in consequence of the conquests of Alexander.

We must pass over the more uninteresting and less relevant portions of the volume, and proceed to where we think the work itself ought to have commenced, namely, at the sixth chapter. The opening of this part will give the reader some idea of the style and spirit which distinguish the writer throughout.

'Soon after the termination of the wars of the Roses, and the restoration of national tranquillity under the Tudors, the English people began to manifest the spirit of maritime discovery, commercial enterprise, and adventurous colonization, which they had inherited from their Saxon ancestors. This spirit had long been suppressed by the Norman aristocracy, alien to England in lineage, language, and feeling; but in the sanguinary struggle between the rival divisions of the Plantagenet family, the Norman nobles had wasted their resources, thinned their ranks, and lost their exclusive possession of political power. Families of Saxon descent began to be raised to the peerage; the forfeiture of monastic lands enabled Henry VIII. to endow the new nobility with estates, and other branches of the same families, emulous of their greatness, sought a road to fame and fortune in the paths which the discoveries of Columbus and Gama had opened to boldness and enterprise. Among all the navigators and adventurers who suddenly appeared under the Tudors, there was scarcely one who could claim affinity with the old Norman nobility; nearly all of them belonged to the class of country gentlemen, the descendants of the Saxon franklins, men who preferred the paths of honourable industry to the gilded profligacy which had usurped the name of chivalry.'

'Previous to the accession of Elizabeth, this country was supplied with Indian commodities from Venice, by an annual ship of great value, and as the Venetians could then charge what price they pleased, the commerce was anything but lucrative to England. The shipwreck of a rich Venetian carrack, on the Isle of Wight, excited the English

merchants and mariners to attempt obtaining a share of the lucrative commerce of the East. Sir William Monson, who witnessed the loss of the vessel, appears to have taken an active part in urging the people of London to attempt to rival the Venetians, and he found the citizens very ready to second his attempts. ‘They devised,’ he says, ‘how such commodities may come into our hands by a more direct way, than to be served, as we were, at second-hand; and therefore resolved to make an overture, by favour of the Queen and her letters, to the Great Turk, for an immediate traffic from England to Turkey, and his dominions, and so thence again, with ships of her own subjects, without being beholden to them (the Venetians). These letters were sent by her Majesty, and received with great humanity and courtesy by the Grand Seignor, as appears by his letters yet extant. In conclusion, the articles were agreed upon, and a grant of great privileges and immunities to her Majesty’s subjects, which have since continued and been peaceably enjoyed. Thus the first trade between England and India was opened through the Levant, and the Turkey merchants were regarded as the true East India traders.*

In 1576, some London merchants, on the suggestion of one Thorne, who had long resided at Seville, and acquired an extensive knowledge of the East Indian trade, believing that it would be possible to discover a new passage by the north-east or north-west to the Indian seas, and thus avoid the tedious navigation round the Capes Horn or Good Hope, fitted out two ships under Captain Forbisher, who made three attempts to effect this passage, but without success. Sir Francis Drake, on returning from his voyage round the world, declared that the route which Thorne had suggested was impracticable, and this opinion has hitherto proved to be well founded. Several other voyagers from England about this time reached India by various routes; but none of them were considered safe or eligible until the celebrated Cavendish opened a certain passage to the East in his voyage round the world, A.D. 1587. He sailed from England in 1586, with three small ships, equipped at his own expense. His course was through the straits of Magellan, and having crossed the

* It appears from Hackbuyl, that there was a very considerable trade to the Levant in English bottoms, between the years 1512 and 1534. He tells us that several stout ships from London, Southampton, and Bristol, had a constant trade to Candia, China, Cyprus, and Beiroot in Syria. Our imports were silks, camlets, rhubarb, malmsies, muscadels, and other wines; sweet oil, cotton goods, carpets, gall, cinnamon, and other spices. Our exports were, fine and coarse kerseys, white western dogans, cloths called statutes, and others called cardinal whites, skins, and leather. From a contemporary document it appears that in this early day, Manchester had already acquired some fame as a manufacturing town, particularly for the production of certain woollen cloths, which, singularly enough, were called *cottons*, a corruption of ‘coatings.’

Pacific to the Indian Archipelago, he visited several of the islands and returned by the Cape of Good Hope to England, where he arrived in September, 1588. 'This voyage was highly instrumental in forwarding the Queen's design of opening a direct trade with the East Indies. The merchants of London were so impressed with the importance of the information, communicated by Cavendish, that they formed themselves into a trading company, and applied to the Queen for a charter. Their request was granted, and in December 1600, the merchant adventurers were incorporated under the title of 'The Governor and Company of Merchants of London, trading to the East Indies.'

Such was the origin of that mercantile association, which has attained, at the present day, to a higher degree of magnitude and importance than any similar corporation in the annals of commercial history. The subscriptions or shares were at first only 50*l.* each, and the original capital 369,891*l.* 5*s.* In 1676, this capital was doubled, by adding the profits to the stock. In the charter of incorporation, the first governor, Thomas Smythe, and twenty-four directors, were nominated by the crown, but power was vested in the proprietors to elect a deputy-governor, and a governor, and other members for the future. In pursuance of the privileges granted by this charter, the new company dispatched five ships, under the command of Captain Lancaster, which reached the roads of Achen on the 5th of June, 1602. One or two commercial treaties were concluded with the kings of the country, after which, and the completion of their cargo, the little squadron returned home, having made a most profitable voyage. Their success led to other voyages, generally attended by the same prosperous results.

We have not space to proceed with any detail of the difficulties the company had to contend with in the outset; the alternating states in the prosperity and decline of its affairs during the reigns of successive English monarchs; the course of its contentions with the rival French East India Company, and the wars of the English with the native princes, until, by the exertions of Watson, Clive, and Coote, British supremacy was established in Bengal and the Carnatic, and the French empire in India was totally annihilated; but the reader will find the transactions and occurrences narrated by Dr. Taylor with as much brevity and conciseness, and at the same time with as much necessary minuteness, in the two chapters devoted to them, as is requisite for the purposes of general instruction and reference. That most interesting portion of the history of British India, from the establishment of the English supremacy to the conclusion of the administration of Warren Hastings, including the wars with Hyder Ali and the important affairs of the Carnatic, is

comprised in the four succeeding chapters. Before introducing the account of the legislative proceedings at home respecting India, towards the close of the premiership of Lord North, Dr. Taylor alludes incidentally to the character of Hastings' Indian administration, observing that 'his proceedings began now to excite much dissatisfaction in England; several of his measures were reprobated by the Court of Directors, and, at length, on the 8th of February, 1785, he resigned his office, and embarked for England. Few rulers of any country have had to encounter more difficulties, and meet so many extraordinary temptations as Mr. Hastings, during his administration in Bengal. His government was, on the whole, popular, both with the English residents and the natives; nor must it be forgotten, whatever may have been his defects, that he was the first, or among the first, servants of the Company, who attempted to acquire any language of the natives, and who set on foot those liberal inquiries into the literature and institutions of the Hindûs, which have led to the satisfactory knowledge of the present day.' We were disappointed at finding the subject of his celebrated impeachment dispatched in a very few lines, on the plea that the circumstances connected with it belong to the history of England rather than of India. Now, we must confess that we cannot perceive the reasonableness of this plea. The trial in question is one of the most interesting of episodes in the annals of our Indian transactions; and amidst a mass of matter comparatively unattractive to most readers for whom this volume is designed, it would have been, we think, a pleasing relief to have found a more detailed account of this celebrated cause. We are justified in this remark, inasmuch as there are several transactions narrated in the work that might, we apprehend, have been more profitably excluded for the like reason. Warren Hastings, on his return home, was impeached by the House of Commons at the bar of the Lords. The trial commenced on the 13th of February, 1788, and ended on the 23rd of April, 1795, in the acquittal of the accused. 'We need only say,' observes the author, 'that Mr. Hastings was mainly indebted for his escape to the eloquence of his accusers; they overstated their case so monstrously that they excited public sympathy for the criminal, and the applause bestowed on their flights of oratory placed them before the public in the light of very graceful actors, not as persons engaged in a grave and serious transaction.' For a more full and satisfactory detail of this memorable trial, Mr. Mills' is the work to be consulted. Its calm and philosophical tone, the author's impartiality and love of truth and justice, and discriminating appreciation of the conduct and character of Hastings, as well as just estimate of the diffi-

culties and temptations under which he acted in his stormy administration, give a peculiar value to his work as a history. With regard to the issue of the trial, there are other facts and circumstances to be mentioned besides what is stated above. There were many things which detracted from the value and authority of this acquittal, notwithstanding the palliations suggested on behalf of the accused, and perhaps justly suggested by the candour of the historian. It has been frequently urged as an undeniable position, and the result of this cause may be regarded as a standing exemplification of its truth, that the House of Lords, from its constitution and character, is unfit to act as a judicial tribunal. It is a political assembly, consisting of the two opposite parties, the one against, and the other in favour of the ruling power; being thus exposed to the corrupting influence of politics, it is generally governed, even in its judicial capacity, by the minister of the day, of which, in our more recent history, we have had ample proofs. Essentially, then, it wants impartiality;* and in the case of Hastings, there were other sources of delusion. There was the hope of sharing in the wealth of India, which had now become a dominant passion, it swayed all the higher classes, the peers included, who lent a reluctant ear to the charges; and this, added to the reputed favour of the king for the accused, rendered the prosecution unpopular. The mode of conducting the defence, too, tended to lessen the value of the acquittal. It was precisely that of a consciously guilty person. Hastings shrunk from, rather than courted, inquiry, and availed himself of all the legal subtleties of a technical defence. The production of certain papers was constantly objected to by him, and much evidence excluded. Is it unreasonable to suppose, therefore, that had he felt conscious of his innocence, and anxious to make it clear to the confusion of his enemies, he would have adopted a line of defence directly the reverse?

Lord Cornwallis assumed the administration of Indian affairs in the month of September, 1786, soon after which came on the war with Tippoo Sultan, which continued during the administration of Sir John Shore (afterwards Lord Teignmouth), and was brought to an end under that of Lord Mornington (the late Marquis of Wellesley), who arrived in Calcutta as governor-general on the 17th of May, 1798. The attack on Seringapatam, and the death of Tippoo, are thus narrated by Doctor Taylor:—

* To be convinced of this, let any one, bearing in mind that the accusation of Hastings was commenced by the Whig party, inspect the list of peers, who voted him '*guilty*' and '*not guilty*', and he will find that the Whig lords present regularly replied in the former, and the Tory lords as regularly in the latter terms.

'General Harris now prepared to execute the intention he had formed of crossing the Cavary, near Soosilly, if it should appear practicable, and of attacking Seringapatam on the western side, in order to facilitate the juncture of the Bombay army, and of the supplies of grain which were expected to come through the western passes. This movement was wholly unexpected by Tippoo; and when he heard that it had been successfully accomplished, he was filled with despair. Having assembled the whole of his principal officers, he said to them, 'We have arrived at our last stage; what is your determination?' 'To die along with you,' was the universal reply.

'On the 5th of April, 1799, the English army appeared before Seringapatam. The labours of the siege proceeded steadily until the 4th of May, which was chosen for the assault. The time fixed was one o'clock, when the orientals usually take some repose during the heat of the day. Seyed Goffhar, Tippoo's ablest officer, sent word to the Sultan that the English were about to make an attack, but Tippoo, misled by astrological predictions, refused to credit the report; and while the Seyed was deliberating on forcing the Sultan to the breach, he was killed by a cannon-shot. Nearly at the same moment, Tippoo received information that his bravest general had fallen, and that the assault was commenced. At half-past one o'clock General Baird stepped out of the trenches, drew his sword, and gave the signal to advance. In less than seven minutes after, the English colours were planted on the summit of the breach. The companies of the two storming divisions wheeled to the right and left as they ascended, fighting their way along the northern and southern ramparts, where every inch of ground was fiercely contested. Thousands fell before the victorious soldiers, and the carnage did not cease until the two divisions met on the eastern rampart. Nothing now remained to be taken but Tippoo's palace, the surrender of which was only delayed by the uncertainty that prevailed respecting the fate of the Sultan. Tippoo had fallen in the heat of the fight, severely wounded by three musket balls: whilst he lay on the ground, an English soldier attempted to tear off his embroidered sword-belt, but the Sultan, who still retained his sabre, made a cut at the man, and wounded him in the knee. The soldier immediately shot him through the head, and his death must have been instantaneous. It was late in the evening before the Sultan's body was found and recognised; but in the meantime, his family had been taken under the protection of the British officers. The body was buried the next day, with military honours, in the mausoleum of Hyder Ali, and a violent storm of thunder and lightning, which destroyed several Europeans and natives, gave an awful interest to these last solemn rites.'—p. 193.

Into the administration of the financial and judicial affairs of India, Lord Cornwallis introduced many important changes (the details of which are given in Mr. Mill's work), which, however, were not so successful as his military operations. They are briefly summed up as follows:—He designed to constitute the

Zemindars, or collectors of the land revenue, a body of landed proprietors, renting their Zemindaries as estates from the Company, and paying the land-tax as a species of rent. This project, which showed utter ignorance of the peculiar tenure of land in India, brought ruin on the Zemindars, and inflicted severe injury on the ryots or cultivators of the soil. Many of the judicial reforms were inapplicable to the social condition of India, and therefore failed to produce the beneficial results which had been too eagerly anticipated. The government of Lord Wellesley was a very interesting and brilliant, but at the same time, a very expensive one. His policy aimed at placing the entire military arrangements of India under the control of the British—a policy which, if carried out, would clearly have given the Company an absolute dominion over all the foreign relations of the Indian princes, and rendered that body the guardian of general tranquillity. Great expenses, indeed, had been incurred, but it was certain that the pressure would only be temporary, for the revenues were beginning to improve, the conquered and ceded districts began to grow profitable after tranquillity had been restored, and the economic reductions, which were commenced as the war drew to a close, gave promise of a large and early surplus revenue from our possessions. The Court of Directors, from the beginning, took a very harsh view, as we are told, of Lord Wellesley's policy, and thwarted him in every particular, where they were not checked by the interference of the Board of Control. The Marquis of Cornwallis, in spite of his accumulated years and infirmities, was appointed the successor of Lord Wellesley; but in the midst of his exertions he sank under the increased fatigue which he had imposed upon himself by a journey to the upper provinces. He was succeeded by Sir George Barlow, a civil servant of the company, who had filled several subordinate situations creditably, but who did not possess the qualifications necessary for a post of so much importance and responsibility as that of governor-general.

Lord Minto reached India in July, 1807, as successor to Sir George Barlow. Of his administration Sir John Malcolm observes, 'that it differs essentially from that of every governor-general who preceded him. It was impossible for a man possessed of such clear intellect, and so well acquainted with the whole scheme of government, to be long in India without being satisfied that the system of neutral policy which had been adopted, could not be persevered in without the hazard of great and increasing danger to the state. His calm mind saw at the same time the advantage of reconciling the authorities in England to the measures which he contemplated. Hence, he ever preferred delay, where he thought that it was unaccompanied with

danger, and referred to the administration at home, whom he urged, by every argument he could use, to sanction the course he deemed best suited to the public interests. But this desire to conciliate and carry his superiors along with him, did not result from any dread of responsibility, for wherever the exigency of the case required a departure from this general rule, he was prompt and decided.' In 1813, Lord Minto returned to England, where a sudden illness shortly afterwards terminated his useful life.

The Marquis of Hastings arrived in Calcutta, October 13th, 1813, with the authority of governor-general; and at such a time it was fortunate that the government of India was entrusted to a nobleman equally distinguished for his diplomatic and military attainments, and who had given many signal proofs of his talents as a soldier and a statesman. At the close of his administration, as Doctor Taylor well observes, the situation of the British power was very different from what it had been when that nobleman first assumed the reins of government. The Company's territories were greatly enlarged, and their revenues increased; the Pindarries were annihilated; the power of the Mahrattas, the most formidable enemies of the British, was annihilated; and Scindia, the only ruler whose resources were undiminished, had shown by all his acts, that he had ceased to cherish any plans of ambition. In 1823, Lord Hastings returned to England, after having filled the station of governor-general for nine years. Differences of opinion may exist regarding some minor points of his government, but none of these points are of a character which can in any degree affect that admiration which is given to all the great measures of his political administration.

In the succeeding chapter, Doctor Taylor relates some interesting particulars of the state of India at the close of the Mahratta war, and treats on the affairs of Hyderabad, the mutiny of Vellore, the disputes and controversy with the Burmese, and the kingdom of Lahore under Runjeet Singh. This brings us to the administration of Earl Amhurst and the Burmese war, one of the longest, and perhaps interesting portions of the volume, on which, however, we lament our inability, from want of space, to dwell. We now arrive at the assumption of the governor-generalship of India by Lord William Bentinck, and his successor, Lord Auckland, and the beginning of the Affghan war. The circumstances under which the former nobleman entered on his arduous duties were of peculiar delicacy and difficulty. Such had been the unavoidable expenditure incurred by previous events of an important character, which had added thirteen millions to the registered debt of the Company, while the outlay of the government far exceeded the resources from which it was to

be defrayed, that the necessity of retrenchment was earnestly urged by the Court of Directors, and the new governor appeared at Calcutta in the unpopular character of a financial reformer. Independent of this, one of his first measures was the publishing of a proclamation, strictly forbidding the practice of *suttee*,—that is, of burning or burying alive the widows of Hindûs. Two remarkable projects were contemplated during his administration, which, as they are incidentally alluded to in Lord Auckland's declaration of his reasons for undertaking the Affghan war, we shall give briefly in Doctor Taylor's own words:—

'The general tranquillity of India during Lord William Bentinck's administration, afforded an opportunity for the prosecution of two great projects, the consequences of which have not been yet fully developed,—the opening of communications with the countries west of the Indus, between that river and the Caspian sea, and the establishment of a steam communication between England and India. The primary object in forming any connexion with the countries west of the Indus, was the extension of British commerce. It was believed that it would be possible to open markets for the sale of British manufactures in the great trading cities of Central Asia; the goods being conveyed by steam-boats up the Indus, and then transported by native merchants across the mountain-passes of the Indian Caucasus. In order to facilitate this desirable object, Lord William Bentinck, during his northern progress, had an interview with Runjeet Singh, the ruler of Lahore, which was one of the most gorgeous displays of oriental magnificence that can be imagined. The King of Lahore expressed himself favourable to such an extension of intercourse, and with rather greater difficulty, the Ameers of Scinde were induced to adopt the same course of policy. Lieutenant, afterwards Sir Alexander Burnes, was encouraged by the governor-general to undertake an exploring tour through the countries of Central Asia, then almost unknown. This enterprising traveller collected very important information respecting the political condition, the commercial relations, and the geographical features of the countries between the Caspian and the Indus; and his subsequent publication of his travels excited a considerable share of public attention in England.'—p. 373.

Lord William Bentinck quitted India in March, 1835. Financial derangements threw a gloom over the close of his administration. The fluctuations to which the government loans were liable, and the ruinous speculations unfortunately entered into by the houses of agency established at Calcutta, brought on a commercial crisis which, in the many bankruptcies it occasioned, inflicted a fearful loss on the commercial community of Calcutta, and reduced many officers to a state of the greatest distress. On this portion of Indian history the author is indebted to 'Mr. Auber's closing remarks on Lord William Bentinck's administration,' from which, as they are equally distinguished by their

force and truth, we regret that we can only find room for the closing extract:—

'The Court of Directors, on learning that his lordship's health constrained him to relinquish the government, passed the following resolution on the 26th of September, 1834:—

'Resolved,—That this court deeply lament that the state of Lord William Bentinck's health should be such as to deprive the Company of his most valuable services; and this court deem it proper to record, on the occasion of his lordship's resignation of the office of governor-general, their high sense of the distinguished ability, energy, zeal, and integrity, with which his lordship has discharged the arduous duties of his exalted station.'

From the time when Lord William Bentinck left India (March, 1835), to the middle of the following year, there was no resident governor-general, owing to the peculiar state of political parties at home. In the meantime, therefore, the supreme authority at Calcutta devolved on Sir Charles Metcalfe, whose brief administration was marked by several concessions to popular opinion, particularly by the abolition of all restrictions on the freedom of the press. On the 4th of July, 1836, Lord Auckland landed at Calcutta, and assumed the reins of government, which everything seemed to promise would not be less pacific under his hands, than under those of his predecessor. His lordship was known to be a consistent supporter of a pacific policy, and eager to carry out those schemes of social improvement which require a period of perfect tranquillity for their full development. His earliest attention was engaged to promote the designs which had been formed for the advancement of native education, and the communication of so much knowledge to the Mohammedans and Hindûs as they were willing to receive. He undertook to improve and facilitate the modes of collecting the landed revenue, corrected the method of impost, and arranged plans calculated to have the best effect in securing property, and preventing encroachment and oppression. He carried out gradually, but steadily, an amended judicial system to the full extent of his powers, and substituted the vernacular tongue for the foreign languages, Arabic and Persian, which were formerly in use, in all courts and administrative transactions,—a measure that, for the first time, made the public proceedings of the Indian government intelligible to its subjects. These and many other similar measures endeared his government to the people, and the administration of Lord Auckland may safely be pronounced to have been, on the whole, a decidedly popular one.

He had not long been in possession of the supreme authority, when circumstances occurred which induced him to enter deeply into the troubled politics of Central and Western Asia, and

eventually to involve his government in a struggle, of which the final issue is yet uncertain. This was an unhappy step, which tended, in addition to its other evils, to detract from his otherwise able and enlightened administration. It is generally admitted that he was drawn into an acquiescence in measures for commencing and carrying on the war in Affghanistan without due reflection as to the consequences, upon insufficient information, and at the instance of certain *attachés*, in whose disinterestedness and sagacity he reposed too great a confidence; these persons gave to facts and events their own colouring, and thus misled his better judgment. Lord Auckland, we are told on good authority, did not sufficiently dissect the motives and objects of his functionaries, nor endeavour to detect the bias under which they acted. Doctor Taylor devotes a chapter to the rise and progress of this criminal war, in which, like all preceding writers, he fails to adduce anything like valid or tangible grounds for its being undertaken. The principal authority he relies on, is the manifesto of the governor-general himself, which is too long for insertion here. But what is wanted is, more light thrown upon antecedent relations and events, which even the work of Mr. Masson fails to supply. On the whole, we can recommend this chapter on the Affghan war, as an able, succinct, and generally impartial account of its important transactions down to the forcing of the Khyber Pass, by General Pollock. The remaining portions of the book, which treat on the Chinese war, and on the English dependencies in the Indian seas, as Ceylon, Singapore, Pulo Penang, Malacca, and the Mauritius, are instructive, and well worthy of the rest of the volume.

Art. VII. *The Advancement of Religion, the Claim of the Times.*
By Andrew Reed, D.D. London: Snow. 1843.

DR. REED says that 'a considerable part of this book is *suggestive*.' So we have found it to be, and as such we shall treat it; comparing or contrasting, now and then, his suggestions for the advancement of religion with the *catholicons* of others. We bespeak, at the outset, therefore, his patience, and the confidence of our readers in our good intentions, and the sympathy of both in our good humour. We want his book to be generally read, for the reasons we shall assign, and his suggestions to be talked over as well as pondered; but we can only make sure of this by a conversational style. Indeed, we cannot combine pathos with point as he does. We have both wept and trembled, as well as rejoiced, in the perusal of his volume, and in that spirit should

prefer to write, were our appeal to Christians only. But as it is not Christians alone that notice the evils which he proposes to remedy, we must address our remarks to the known condition of the parties whom we are desirous of influencing.

The title of this work is now the watch-word of all churches and religious societies. They do not all mean by religion, nor by the advancement of it, the same thing; and thus do not try to advance it in the same way or spirit. But, whatever they mean by religion, they are fully bent upon advancing it, and evidently because 'the Times' require special measures for that purpose.

Popery feels and avows this fact, and thus virtually acknowledges that the ordinary routine of her 'enchantments' can neither spread nor preserve her sway in times like the present. Accordingly, she has unfurled her old missionary banner, and in PARIS first! for the conversion of heathen and heretics; and that chiefly by the prayers of the *Archie-Confrérie*; the members of which, in Paris, increased last year, at the rate of ten thousand a month, and now amount to millions on the Continent; all pledged to pray to the Virgin for the conversion of England, and the Romanizing of the world. Thus infallibility proclaims from the Vatican, and without thunder, that the advancement of religion is *the* claim of the times; and, for once, his Holiness is right; or, not so far wrong as some who deny his infallibility. He resigns his anathemas to Mr. Palmer, of Oxford, and instead of adding more candles to the altar, lets the faithful pray without book for our conversion. Episcopacy also sees and owns in the times, an imperative claim for the advancement of religion, and is meeting it by building new churches, and enforcing old rubries, and flirting with Babylon. Some of the champions of the church,—like the governor-general of India, who sees in the times there, reasons for restoring the gates of Somnauth to the Hindoos, from whom the Mahomedans stole them ages ago,—see in the times here, that the altar is no longer safe without the candles, nor the pulpit without the surplice, nor the Sabbath without the festivals, that popery stole from paganism. Accordingly, like 'the gates of Somnauth,' these Palladiums are coming back by 'proclamation,' to their old shrines; for, strange to tell, whilst poor Lord Ellenborough is both lampooned and denounced for symbolizing with Hindooism, our home-traders in and licensed hawkers of heathen '*sandal-wood*,' although symbolizing quite as much with popery, are deemed the pillars of the church! We have read, as in duty bound, all the published 'mysteries of *Isis*,' for meeting the claims of the times by the advancement of religion; but we have found none of their nostrums either so rational or Scriptural as the prayer-crusade of the *Archie-confrérie*. Indeed, neither secret prayer,

except on saints days, nor the Bible, except in church, might have any connexion with the advancement of religion, for anything that Puseyism writes to commend them. Its sole remedy for all that is evil or ominous in our new times, is the ritual of old times.

The church of Scotland takes another and very different view of the claims of the times. Instead of trying to bring back anything that John Knox threw *out* of the kirk, she is trying to keep all that he brought *into* it. She thinks, and justly, that neither the crown nor the civil courts ought to control her spiritual jurisdiction, nor patronage to intrude her ministry. She sees that her people cannot be kept within her pale, nor her pale itself be kept evangelical, in such times as the present, by the nominees of lords, lairds, or cabinets. Many of her best sons, therefore, are ready to unfurl the old banner of the Covenant on the blue hills of Scotland, and to follow it, if necessary, like the covenanters, at all hazards. Vital presbyterianism, in the kirk, deems a demonstration of this kind to be one of the imperative duties of the times; and vital presbyterianism *out* of the kirk, feels that it owes to the times, to welcome the fellowship of all voluntary churches that hold the Head, as well as to revise somewhat its own standards. In regard to Methodism, except its spirited protests against Puseyism, we are not aware of any new public measure which that hard working church has adopted, in order to meet the claims of the times. Perhaps, her old machinery, if well worked, will enable her to serve her generation better than she could do by other means.

So far, we have not referred to anything that is common to all churches, for advancing religion; and for a little still, we must just glance at what is peculiar or new amongst dissenters at this crisis. Not, however, that we are about to embroil ourselves in any of the points at issue between baptists and paedobaptists. We expect, indeed, to put both denominations into good humour with each other, and with ourselves too, by telling them kindly of the somewhat *new* forms that the times have given to their old disputes. Now, Puseyism is their mutual dread, especially as it advocates baptismal regeneration more plausibly than was wont in the olden time; and, therefore, the advancement of religion against this baneful heresy, is one of the claims of our own times on each party. Both know to a certainty—we were about to say, instinctively—that they have no sympathy whatever with the regenerationists, except pity for their infatuation. The call made upon each denomination to dismiss from its fellowship all members belonging to the other; or, upon such members to withdraw at once, and rally under their own baptismal banner, was therefore peculiarly ill-timed, however well meant; for it

was aping in a small way the exclusiveness of episcopacy, without even the paltry excuse of protesting against heresy or schism. Of the same kind, also, are all the suspicions, on both sides, of envy or ill will. Neither side is really convinced of their truth, nor glad to find any grounds for them. The deepest, and dearest, and most vital conviction of both denominations is, that neither prefers its peculiarity to the gospel, or would care the turning of a straw for even the *universality* of its own baptism, apart from its own glorying in the cross of Christ. Both would weep and tremble alike over either a sprinkled or an immersed world, if it were not also ‘mighty in the Scriptures,’ and thus, in the position of being ‘baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ In like manner, both are of one heart and one mind, in regard to the rampant errors of the times, and rely mainly on each other, so far as their reliance is at all human, for the energies that will fight the battle of the Reformation again, should that become necessary. They have no mutual suspicions of each other’s love or zeal for the gospel. Should a ‘field day’ come, the church would not find them *two* denominations, but *one* army, with the same banner and watchword. Besides, as the *first* missionary churches, they have both the confidence and sympathy of all the missionary churches in the world with them. Even those that differ most from them, admire their missionary spirit, and feel that, as they were the fathers of this spirit, so will they be its defenders, even if its defence should cost *blood* as well as labour and money. They seem to *themselves*, occasionally, to be on the eve of an open rupture, or of a final breach; but this is all mere seeming; and that only to *themselves*. The church sees nothing of the kind in their squabbles. She sees, indeed, that they occasionally agitate each other, and thus give her short intervals of rest; but she knows that they agitate each other only as the stars do, around a magnetic centre that binds them to ‘their courses,’ and blends their lights. No nonconformist union appears to the hierarchy so indissoluble as that of the Independents and Baptists; and just because it is a *spiritual* union, that their own differences cannot disturb; for even these throw them, for ever, direct upon its foundation—the New Testament; and thus further off than ever from all hierarchical and political influence. ‘The Church’ thinks, at times, that she can make something of Methodism, and that her state-anchorage has an ally in Presbyterianism; but she never dreams even of acquiring any hold on, or deference from, the descendants of Owen or Bunyan, except through her evangelical clergy; and she dislikes to be represented by them, or to be indebted to them for any of her national influence. She may see some room, if not for ‘the sole of her foot,’ yet for her ‘little finger,’ on the platform of other

churches ; but the waters of Noah presented to Noah's dove not a more unmanageable or hopeless element than pure dissent seems to her. She can conceive of nothing but law, that could make it subside from her, or succumb to her ; but she is afraid to play *Canute*, by lashing the waves. She can, when she is in the humour, battle it with Rome, because she knows antiquity quite as well as Rome herself, and thus can keep infallibility at bay, with some appearance of having the best side of the question ; but she feels that she might as well quote Chillingworth or Whately to the pope, as quote fathers, councils, or tradition, to dissenters. Not that she thinks them ignorant of antiquity, but because they own no other authority in religion than the New Testament ; and thus, like Job's Leviathan, ' laugh at the shaking of spears' from any armory but that of God.

Dr. Reed must forgive us for going a little further yet in our own way. We have often and long wished for a fair opportunity of telling the two great denominations of dissenters, how much they are really 'one body,' and how much they are felt to be so by the hierarchy. We do not wish, however, to mix up his book with our own lucubrations. We shall do justice to it before we close ; but, in the meantime, we must try to do justice to the Independents and Baptists, in order to help them to appreciate each other duly ; for this they must do before they can act out Dr. Reed's suggestions for the advancement of religion. Now, neither their distinctions nor divisions, as churches, divert the hierarchy from dwelling on their real union around the New Testament. Nothing moves either body a hairbreadth from this 'pillar and ground of the truth.' If they do not always shake hands around that pillar, they never shake it, nor desert it. It is their common and sole centre ; and thus it makes them *one* body, and their orbit but one, to the hierarchy. 'High church,' (for we do not refer at all to the church of Christ in the ecclesiastical corporation of England and Ireland,) sees that whilst this union subsists, she can have no great influence in their orbit, nor any moral attraction for them in her own. She, therefore, contents herself with calling them 'wandering stars,' and with leaving nothing between them and 'the blackness of darkness,' but *uncovenanted* mercy. But the very bitterness and frequency with which this is done, betrays, on the part of 'high church,' deep mortification. She knows full well, and feels with all the keenness of an acute sensation, that dissenters have been 'the morning stars' of missionary enterprise ; 'wandering,' only to lead the heathen to Christ. Would Baptists, and Independents, and Methodists, only stay at *home*, and thus not force upon public attention, glaring *contrasts* between 'the apostles of the Lamb' and modern bishops, 'high church' would have more

patience with them; but as they only thin her ranks at home, and take precedence of episcopacy abroad, and must now wield for ever the chief sceptre of missions in the world, she has no patience with them.

Thus have they placed the worldly hierarchy before the world; and, therefore, they must peril the world, if they plague each other, or do not co-operate visibly and cordially. They can keep in check at home, and a-head of abroad, all that is *rampant* in the hierarchy; and as all that is rampant is unscriptural also, and thus ruinous to souls, it is of infinite importance now, that Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, hold themselves to be 'set' by God 'for the defence of the Gospel,' and not for the diffusion of their peculiarities.

Let the Baptists and Independents, especially, look at their own moral position in Asia, in virtue of the translations of the Scriptures by their missionaries. It is unparalleled in the world, and only surpassed in the history of the church by the completion of the canon. It is the *envy* of all hierarchies that have any dependence on Scripture for the advancement of religion. They see that the two great dissenting missionary societies have done what universities could not, and what must give them an unapproachable vantage-ground for ever, throughout India and China. No gift of bishops to Asia, were they all Hebers and Wilsons, and sent out by dozens, will ever eclipse, or be compared with, the gift of translations, when Asia shall 'turn unto the Lord.' Her *Pentecost* will for ever date from Serampore and Canton. Carey and Morrison will always be her Luther and Wycliffe. What is any opinion these denominations have respecting the precise import of a ceremonial word, or ground of complaint, compared to their mutual position, so sublime, commanding, and responsible, towards 'all Asia?' Why, had the two societies neither personal nor home reasons for vital and visible unity, their mutual relation to Asia alone, as it can never be superseded in time but by themselves, nor forgotten in eternity, ought to make them one in heart and hand, even as God and the Lamb are one.

And now, if we turn from the east to the west, the aspects and claims of things are the same. In the Pacific Ocean, indeed, the London Missionary Society has had the field to itself, so far as the English Baptists are concerned. But in the West Indies, the two societies have been one, both in their trials and triumphs. For what is to divide the martyred Smith, of Demerara, from his all but martyred brethren in Jamaica, or the daring of Knibb from the diplomacy of Dr. Philip, or either of them from the lasting love and veneration of the religious bodies whose joint property they are? And what can separate the invaluable

results produced by the missionaries of the one society in British Guiana, by a method of organized co-operation which has come to be designated, somewhat quaintly, 'The Leader and Ticket System,' from the results not less valuable, and more vast, produced under the same system by the missionaries of the other society in Jamaica? Neither of these great societies, as such, can sympathize in the assiduity or skill which may be displayed in any quarter, in picking *holes* in the garment of its fellow, or in the folly which would obliterate by wholesale those evangelical honours that cannot be denied to one society without being withheld from both. Each has brilliant proofs of visible success, which may challenge and endure the scrutiny of the world, as the work of God, although there may be found in both some of the evils which were so conspicuous in the early churches. We would not have either Society blind to, or unwilling to look at anything wrong on both sides, much less that each should look only at the *bright* side of what is the **PILLAR** of its own camp, and only on the *dark* side of it on the other. The world is in full lynx-gaze on the dark side of both pillars; and let the world gaze and tell too what it sees, we say! But let not the world be led to suspect, and thus to search for, evils it would never have even dreamt of, but for recriminations which, in their haste to correct evils, confounded the good with the bad, or overlooked it. Both Societies can well afford, without at all implicating either their principles or spirit, to make all the concessions and deductions too, that even an enemy would demand, in the case of the West Indian and Polynesian churches. It is as much the *glory* of both Societies not to wink at either the chaff or the tares in their missionary fields, as to possess a harvest of good wheat. And as 'angels will be the reapers' at last, why should the *sowers* strive now? especially as they will soon be both with and 'like the angels of God.'

We do not forget that Jamaica is delicate ground. But we know it too well to be either deterred or intimidated by its delicacy. Indeed, we should feel, and our readers would think, that we had done nothing to the purpose were we to stop here. Besides, we would not have begun at all, had we not seen clearly that Jamaica might be made the grand reason, at this moment, for the unity we advocate and anticipate. Even the waters of Marah may be healed, notwithstanding all their bitterness. Would all who complain of the bituminous springs deplore the bitterness, in the meek spirit of Moses, the Lord would soon 'show them a tree by which the waters might be made sweet.' Dr. Reed sees that tree clearly.

In the meantime, however, all ought to look far more at the

relation of the converted negroes to their own race and country, than at their present relations to British missions, and to identify the Jamaica churches with *Africa*, not with England. Their English relations are dissolving already, as to both their form and degree; and even the spirit of them will soon take a new direction, although not an unfriendly one to their old patrons. Besides, whatever the Jamaica churches become, they can never have any direct influence now upon either the position or progress of any society or denomination at home. They can neither extend nor strengthen here, any of the various names they bear. In reference to Britain, they will just be churches of the same 'order' as her own, and nothing more. Their practical influence upon Protestant churches will be in *America*, and there it will tell powerfully upon all slave-holding churches, if we take care to elevate the native mind and character. It will tell, too, upon both Western and Northern Africa for incalculable good or evil, according as missionaries *sanctify* much or little.

We bespeak and beseech consideration to this view of the Negro churches in the colonies. Whenever they come to feel their own strength, both as Christians and as a people—and they are beginning to find it out already—they will care infinitely more for their brethren in America, and their race in Africa, than about the denominational peculiarities that now divide them. Any notoriety that any sect or society here derives from the proportion in which Negroes are identified with them, will be less than nothing in the estimation of Negroes when they appreciate the *condition* of their 'kindred according to the flesh,' all over the world. Even then, indeed, they may retain their present ecclesiastical distinctions, and spread them, too, in the usual spirit of rivalry; but they will be as 'the heart of one man' on behalf of their chained brethren in America, and of the homes of their fathers in Africa. Wisely or unwisely, but certainly with ardent and indomitable spirit, they will move upon both, and find means to make the American churches hear and heed them, and the African tribes to welcome them. This is their destiny, and will soon be their grand distinction. The intelligence and purity of the Negro churches, therefore, ought to be the supreme concern of all the Societies they belong to. Each is unspeakably interested in—yea, responsible for the tone of mind and character that must thus re-act soon upon two Continents. For, we repeat it, the African churches in the colonies can never prove or promote at home any of the peculiarities of any church. They can only be a *credit* or a *disgrace* to the communions whose name they bear, and the Societies that now influence them. No folly, therefore, can be more egregious, nor

any crime more fatal, than to check holy jealousy of their intelligence or purity, whatever quarter it comes from; or, on the other hand, to cherish such jealousy as is likely to exasperate the warm, or discourage the weak, whatever motive be assigned for it. The wise formation of African character, for African purposes all over the world, cannot be secured by either extreme candour, or extreme rigidness. Whoever would screen the Negro churches from the scrutiny of the New Testament, or subject them to tests that would unchristianize the churches at home, is not their friend, nor the friend of Africa. Undue leniency can only prolong the childish and superstitious elements of the African mind, and undue rigour only irritate the fiery and sanguine elements of it. Well saith the Scripture, ' He that ruleth over men should be just, and as the light of the morning when the sun riseth on a morning without clouds.' (2 Sam. xxiii. 3.)

We are not insensible to, nor unsympathizing with, the position in which the missionaries of all the Societies in Jamaica have placed themselves, and each other, on this subject. Arbitrating between them, however, even if we were capable of doing so, would not secure their own chief object; for, after all, no one can doubt that it is their chief desire to lead on the African mind to both manliness and godliness, although by somewhat different processes. Each of them, therefore, will find both his justification and reward eventually, not from any adjudication of the points on which they are now at issue, but in the holy results which all their hearts love, and long to realize. Let them only train the Negroes to regenerate Africa, and Europe, America, and Asia will soon do them ample justice and honour.

Such are some of the trains of thought and feeling that Dr. Reed's work has suggested to us; and if we have hitherto given more prominence to our own opinions than to his positions, it has been from any cause but disrespect to him or his book. Our real and sole object in writing as we have done is, that his book may not be confounded at all with our opinions, nor be supposed to go into the questions we have mooted upon his hints. We believe that we have been both thinking out some of his best hints, and carrying out his grand design by the process we have thus far pursued. This may be a mistake on our part. Be that as it may, however, we have no apology to make to him or any one else for our well-meant effort to promote 'the unity of the Spirit' amongst the two great bodies of evangelical dissenters.

We would now say, with solemnity and affection, to all who sympathize with the spirit and purpose of this article, study Dr. Reed's work. It is impossible to do so without being alternately abased for our divisions, and filled with wonder and gratitude for the vital elements of unity which we possess.

So far, and too far, perhaps, we have treated Dr. Reed's work as 'suggestive.' But although it suggested, and would justify, were that necessary, both the line and spirit of this article, it is in nowise responsible for either, and ought not to be identified with them at all. This will be obvious from its contents:—
1. The Advancement of Religion Desirable. 2. Its Advancement in the Person. 3. By Personal Effort. 4. In the Family. 5. By the Ministry. 6. In the Church. 7. By the Church. 8. In the Nation. 9. In the World. 10. The Certainty and Glory of the Consummation.' It will be seen at once that this is a panoramic view of 'the kingdom of God,' which cannot be analyzed without being injured. Any formal review of it, in detail, would present only such meagre outlines as are given in the description books of a grand panorama. Indeed, we could not have reviewed it in detail, even if we had had no purpose to serve but its own success; and *that*, we are very anxious to promote, for many reasons besides the one we have chiefly yielded to. It is a wise, impressive, and inspiring book, in reference to all the ways in which religion needs and claims to be advanced. It could only have been written by one who had actually tried, long and fully, the experiments it commends. Dr. Reed may well say, 'that all the suggestions are the fruit of actual experiment, or of careful observation and comparison.' Many of them, it is well known, '*have been proved*' during his own successful ministry. It is not, however, a work on revivals, in the technical sense of that word, but is more calculated to *revive* the church than all the revival books of the age put together, his own not excepted. No Christian, public or private, can read it without being revived in all his best feelings, nor without seeing both what is wanted, and how that may be attained; for its real, although not exactly avowed object, is 'to CONVERT Christians to their own opinions.'—*Preface*, p. 7.

This seems a paradox at first sight; but the reader soon finds that his own conversion is going on, even as to those points in his creed, where the cordiality of his faith and love is the chief evidence of his conversion of God. He meets with no new truths, nor even with old truths in very new forms; but somehow, they have new power and glory about them. He finds that there is more meaning in the gospel, and more mind in himself, than ordinary reading or hearing brings out. If he happen to know Coleridge, he is reminded of his expression, 'Giving new force to old truths, that had long lain *bedridden* in the memory.' And then, this force is given to them, not by any stratagem, nor even by studied strokes of eloquence, but by placing them in natural lights and positions, which bring forth both their purpose and proportions at once, as well as the will and power of the mind to apprehend and appreciate them.

Art. VIII. *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, A.M., Principal of the University of Glasgow.* Edited from the Author's Manuscripts by David Laing, Esq. In three volumes. Royal 8vo. Vol. III. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle.

IN our notice of the former volumes of this beautiful reprint of Principal Baillie's *Letters and Journals*, we intimated an intention, on the completion of the edition, to give a brief sketch of the author's life.* To this task we now address ourselves, and at the outset, beg to acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Laing for the assistance he has rendered us in the *Memoir* subjoined to the present volume. His biographical sketch constitutes a valuable addition to the work, which is brought out in a style alike honourable to the society from which it emanates, and the editor to whom its supervision has been entrusted.

Robert Baillie was born in the Salt-market of Glasgow, on Friday, the 30th of April, 1602, of respectable parents, connected with many families of distinction in the west of Scotland. His early education was received under the parental roof, whence he was removed to the public school, where Robert Blair, an eminent presbyterian divine, was then assistant master. In his 'Historical Vindication of the Government of the Church of Scotland,' dedicated in 1646 to Blair, Baillie makes grateful mention of the benefits received from his early tutor. 'My heart,' he says, 'blesses the goodnesse of God, who in a very rich mercy to me did put almost the white and razed table of my spirit under your hands, after my domestick instructions, which were from mine infancy, to be engraven by your labours and example with my first most sensible and remaining impressions, whether of piety, or of good letters, or of morall vertue; what little portion in any of these it hath pleased the Lord of his high and undeserved favour to bestow upon me: I were ungratefull if I should not acknowledge you, after my parents, the first and principall instrument thereof.'

In 1617, Baillie entered the college of Glasgow, where he took the degree of Master of Arts, in 1620. As he intended to devote himself to the ministry of the church of Scotland, he continued his attendance at college, and was prevented by his straitened means only from visiting one of the foreign universities. During the early part of his college life, Robert Boyd, of Trochrig, 'a man of very singular learning and accomplishments,' was Principal of the university. Boyd was a firm presbyterian, and was consequently distasteful to James I. and his

* New Series. Vol. X., p. 633.

prelatical advisers. He was therefore compelled to resign his office, and was succeeded after the interval of a year by John Cameron, a great favourite of the king. During his brief incumbency, Cameron succeeded in instilling into the minds of his students the doctrine of passive obedience, then so diligently enforced by the parasites of the English court. To this, Baillie alludes in a subsequent period of his life, acknowledging that he 'had drunken in, without examination, from a Master Cameron, in my youth, that slavish tenet, that all resistance to the Supreame Magistrate in anie case was simplie unlawful.'

On the 16th of August, 1625, Baillie was admitted to the office of regent in the college, on which occasion he delivered an inaugural oration, *De Mente Agente*. Six years later, he was appointed to the benefice of Kilwinning, Ayrshire, on the presentation of Hugh, Lord Montgomery, previously to which event, he received orders from James Law, Archbishop of Glasgow. Soon afterwards it was in contemplation to effect his removal to one of the churches in Edinburgh, which caused him to address a letter to his 'verie worthie and much respected friend,' Mr. Robert Fleming, one of the magistrates of that city. This letter, together with the answer which it called forth, is printed by Mr. Laing, and possesses very considerable interest in connexion with the ecclesiastical opinions of Baillie. Whatever those opinions subsequently became, it is obvious from the letter to Mr. Fleming, that he was far from sympathizing at this period with the views of the more zealous and thorough-going presbyterians. 'I pray you remember,' he says, 'that my opinions in religion, which I never mind to dissemble, neither in private nor publict, they are such as could not be tolerat by many now there. To avow and practise manie of the Englishe ceremonies, to count these schismatiques that holds it unlawfull to communicat with kneelers, yow know it to be verie hatefull doctrine to many there; and yet this is my mind, and long soe hes been: Also to preach against all points of Arminianisme and Papistrie, especiallie the doctrine of our new Cassandrian moderators yow know likewayes how hatefull it is to these men who now are able for few words to put their brethren from their ministrie, yea, cast them in the straitest prisons.'

The ecclesiastical policy of the English court at this time was as unwise as it could well be. Instead of regarding the prepossessions of the Scottish people, it sought with a high hand to force episcopacy upon them, reckless alike of the religious grievance and the social disorganizations thereby inflicted. A more thoughtful and moderate course might have accomplished much of what the English court contemplated. The race of old presbyterian ministers would gradually have died off, and sufficient

candidates would have been found conformable to the policy of Charles, who for sordid motives would

'Creep and intrude, and climb into the fold.'

The zeal of Laud, however, was too intemperate to admit of forethought. He hurried on his measures with a fatuity which bordered on madness—on the one hand, alienating the nobility by advancing churchmen to the highest offices of the state, and on the other offending beyond redemption the mass of the people, by forcing on them 'a great and insupportable grievance.' The service-book was proclaimed on the 21st of December, 1636, and Baillie, though alarmed at this attempt to impose a form of service which no one had seen, was yet inclined by his education, habits, and relationships, to comply with the instructions of his ecclesiastical superiors to the utmost extent that conscience permitted. Some of his brethren more perspicacious than himself, and better informed respecting the policy of the English court, saw at once the danger that was threatened, and proclaimed as with the voice of a trumpet that *reconciliation with Popery was intended.* Such was the warning uttered by Samuel Rutherford from his place of confinement at Aberdeen, and the heart of the nation responded to his appeal. The train was thus laid which required only a spark for its ignition, and the explosion for which all thoughtful observers looked, took place in the July following. Of this circumstance and its immediate consequences, Mr. Laing thus speaks:—

'The tumult at Edinburgh, on the 23rd of July, 1637, on occasion of the first using the Service-Book, was the spark which kindled a flame that spread over the whole land. According to the deliberate judgment of the Privy Council, after minute investigation, they could only report to his Majesty that this 'barbarous tumult' proceeded from 'a number of base and rascall people.' It was an act altogether unpremeditated; but the spirit of resistance having thus openly manifested itself, supplications from every part of the Kingdom were presented to the Council, urging, that the service enjoined was contrary to the religion then professed, and that it was introduced in a most unwarrantable manner without the knowledge or approbation of a General Assembly, and in opposition to Acts of Parliament. The clergy, nobility, and all ranks of people, flocked to Edinburgh with such petitions against the use of the liturgy: being encouraged by their increasing numbers, and irritated by delays and by the evasion of their first humble requests, they became sufficiently formidable; and enlarging their demands, they at length succeeded not only in having the service-book withdrawn, but in restoring presbytery in its purest form, and in relieving the Church from the thraldom of her prelatic oppressors. From this time the history of the country is that of the Church, and it exhibits a succession of events partaking more of the

character of romance than of scenes in ordinary life. But the history of that period is so well known, and Baillie's letters furnish so full and distinct an account of the more remarkable occurrences of the time, that in this memoir it will only be necessary to allude to such events as have some relation to the Author himself.'—*p. xxxv.*

Up to this period, Baillie had been favourable to a limited kind of episcopacy. 'Bishops,' he says, 'I love, but pride, greed, luxury, oppression, immersion in secular affairs, was the bane of the Romish prelates, and cannot long have good success in the reformed.' At the desire of his patron, he attended a meeting of the supplicants at Edinburgh in October, on which occasion he was evidently regarded with some distrust by his brethren. Referring to the question put by the chairman to each of the ministers present, respecting their dissent from the service book, Baillie tells us, 'I was posed somewhat more narrowly, because they suspected my mind in those things.' His hesitation, however, to concur in the measures of the more rigid presbyterians, did not arise from any attachment to the service-book, of many parts of which he thoroughly disapproved, whilst his lingering regard to episcopacy was speedily destroyed by the events which transpired. The national covenant was signed on the last day of February, 1838, and a Board of Commissioners entitled 'The Tables,' was instituted in Edinburgh to deliberate on, and manage the affairs of the supplicants.

The events which followed are well known to the historical reader. Charles determined to coerce the Scotch covenanters into obedience, and the latter perceiving his intention, prepared to defend their liberties. The crisis searched deeply into the hearts of men, moving their strongest passions, and shaping their course by the primary interests of their being, rather than by the flimsy theories which the schools had taught them. Baillie abandoned his notion of passive obedience, and on the commencement of hostilities, accompanied Lord Eglintoun as chaplain to his soldiers. The account which he has furnished of the Scottish army as it lay encamped on Duns Law, about the 7th of June, 1639, is amongst the most graphic and interesting passages of his correspondence. 'It would have done you good,' he says, 'to have cast your eyes athort our brave and rich hill as oft as I did with great contentment and joy. . . . I furnished to half-a-dozen of good fellows muskets and picks, and to my boy a broad sword. I carried myself, as the fashion was, a sword and a couple of Dutch pistols at my saddle; but I promise for the offence of no man, except a robber in the way; for it was our part alone to preach and pray for the encouragement of our countreymen, which I did to my power most cheerfullie.'

The pacification of Berwick, proclaimed on the 18th of June,

prevented a collision of the hostile forces, and produced a temporary pause in the storm. That pause, however, was but short-lived. Charles had neither the prudence nor the good faith to abide by the terms of the pacification ; and the covenanters, encouraged by communications from England, crossed the Tweed in the autumn of 1640. Baillie was summoned to the Scottish forces at Newcastle, whence he was despatched to London as one of the commissioners for conducting the treaty with the king. We need not dwell on the state of parties in England at this time, as it is well known to our readers. A long course of misrule had alienated the people from their governors, and induced even moderate and timid politicians to contemplate changes of which their fathers never dreamed. The iron sway of Strafford, which had shown itself unchecked in the North, and still more cruelly in Ireland, had admonished all thoughtful men of the doom to which English liberty was destined by the ministers of Charles, whilst the infatuated and brutal intolerance of Laud, had arrayed against the government the religious prepossessions of the puritans. The unpopularity of the monarch, and the embarrassed state of his finances, prevented his meeting the Scotch forces in the manner he desired. He advanced as far as York, but was there compelled to summon a great council of his nobility, to whom he announced his intention of immediately convening a parliament as the only means of extricating himself from the difficulties of his position. It was well for English liberty that the popular party possessed at this time such leaders as Pym and Hampden, men who united largeness of intellect, with an inflexibility of purpose which nothing could move, and an integrity that was above all suspicion. Intimately acquainted with the national character, sensible of the wrongs which had been inflicted, and fully assured of the inextinguishable hatred borne by Charles and his ministers to English freedom, these distinguished patriots resolved on a decided, yet calm course, and were well sustained by their associates. ‘ There was observed,’ says Clarendon, ‘ a marvellous elated countenance in many of the members of parliament before they met together in the House ; the same men who six months before were observed to be of very moderate tempers, and to wish that gentle remedies might be applied without opening the wound too wide and exposing it to the air, and rather to cure what was amiss, than too strictly to make inquisition into the causes and original of the malady, talked now in another dialect both of things and persons.’*

But we must not leave the biography of Baillie for general

* Hist. of Rebellion. Vol. I., p. 298.

history, however tempting the theme. Suffice it, therefore, to remark that the state of feeling which he found prevalent in London, was equally untemporizing, intense, and practical, as that which he had witnessed in Edinburgh. He was early engaged in drawing up *The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners against Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Earl of Strafford*, which was presented to the House of Lords on the 17th of December, and in the publication of several controversial treatises against the service-book, Arminianism and Episcopacy. His account of Strafford's trial, contained in the early portion of his correspondence, furnishes the most graphic view which has been preserved to us of that memorable event, that constituted the first act of the most solemn and imposing drama ever acted on the theatre of a great nation.

Baillie returned to Scotland in June 1641, and was a member of the General Assembly which met at St. Andrew's in the following month. A professorship was offered him in each of the four universities, and a design was entertained, by some of his friends, of effecting his removal to a parochial charge in Glasgow. As long as was practicable, he resisted these efforts to remove him from his beloved charge at Kilwinning. Finding, however, 'that the Assembly, which possessed uncontrolled power in such matters, might at once order him to be translated to some place less congenial to his habits than that of his birth and education, and where he still would be in the midst of his friends and relations, he, with some reluctance, in June 1642, accepted the invitation to become Dickson's colleague as joint professor of divinity in the university of Glasgow.'

He was not destined long to remain in the comparative obscurity of his academical life, for in the following year we find him again in London as a Commissioner to the Assembly of Divines. He took an active part in the consultations of his brethren, and was especially relied on for the diligence and accuracy with which he dissected the controversial writings of their opponents. The unsatisfactory state of the parliament's affairs compelled the English patriots to make advances to the Scotch, who, availing themselves of the critical position of their allies, insisted on the adoption of *the Solemn League and Covenant*, as the basis of union between the two kingdoms. 'The English,' says Baillie, 'were for a civil league; we, for a religious covenant. When they were brought to us in this, and Mr. Henderson had given them a draught of a covenant, we were not like to agree on the frame; they were, more than we could assent to, for keeping of a door open in England to independency. Against this we were peremptory.' A compromise was at length effected by the adoption of a general phraseology, which each party hoped to have interpreted according to its own views.

Baillie returned to Scotland early in 1645, to report to the General Assembly the progress of presbyterianism in England. He set out from London, in company with George Gillespie, on the 6th of January, and arrived at Newcastle on the 18th, 'verie wearie and fashed with a long evill way.' To the Assembly, which met at Edinburgh, he reported the unanimity with which the English parliament had abolished the ceremonies and service book, and had plucked up the 'root of all the branches of episcopacies in all the king's dominions.' A confident expectation was expressed of the speedy establishment of presbyterianism according to the forms of the *Directory*, and the fullest complacency was avowed in the actual and prospective state of things. 'Such stories lately told,' remarked Baillie, 'would have been counted fancies, dreams, mere impossibilities; yet this day we tell them as deeds done, for the great honour of God, and we are persuaded the joy of many a godlie soul. If any will not believe our report, let them trust their own eyes; for behold here are the warrant of our words, written and subscryved by the hands of the clerks of the parliament of England, and the scribes of the assemblie there.'

He speedily returned to London, where he preached before the House of Lords, July 30th, entitling his sermon, which was afterwards printed by order of the House, *Errors and Induration are the great Sins and the great Judgments of the Times*. About the same period, he published his *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time*; in the course of which he bitterly inveighed against the numerous sects which claimed toleration from the government, and denounced such toleration as a grievous evil. His hopes were greatly moderated at this time, by the inability of his countrymen to strengthen their army in England. Montrose held them in check by his rapid and devastating movements, and the Scotch commissioners consequently despaired of making a satisfactory settlement of ecclesiastical affairs. Referring to some controverted point in which the views of his party were opposed by the Independents, he remarks with a simplicity which creates a smile, 'with which we propose not to meddle in haste, until it please God to advance our armie, *which we expect will much assist our arguments*,' and, at a later date, he adds, 'Had our armie been but one 15,000 men in England, our advyce would have been followed quicklie in all things.' Baillie was not far wrong in his opinion, but happily for religious liberty the Scotch army could neither advance nor be reinforced, and the English patriots were in consequence free to reject the ecclesiastical servitude which the presbyterians sought to impose. Mr. Laing speaks in much milder terms than the occasion demands, of the persecuting tenets of the presbyterians of this period. We are

sorry he has done so, as the honour of his own system, as well as the fidelity of history, require an unhesitating condemnation of the principles they promulgated, and the spirit of which they were the impersonation. The facts of the case are too glaring to admit of contradiction, and they constitute a salutary lesson, the force of which ought not to be diminished by such diluted statements as the following :—

' It is usual to assert that the first correct notions of toleration or religious liberty originated with the Independents. The Presbyterians in both kingdoms were indeed strongly opposed to allowing toleration of any sects; and it must be admitted that the Ecclesiastical Courts, Presbyterian as well as Prelatic, when they had the power, displayed no unequivocal symptoms of inquisitorial judicatures. Had Church-government been established in both kingdoms, in the form proposed, doubtless in such an event the rules of discipline would have been strictly enforced, and their proceedings might, in some measure, have justified the ordinary accusations of intolerance and persecution. But when we look into the history of that period and consider the effects of such licence in the rapid growth of heresies of all kinds, and the bitter spirit that was engendered among the various sects, it would be unjust to accuse Baillie and his friends as alone chargeable with intolerance; and he himself strives to vindicate the Presbyterians from whatever could be said to evince a persecuting spirit. The Independents, it is true, asserted the right of liberty to themselves in matters of religion, and also urged the plea of toleration of all sects, however erroneous; but it is not less certain that when the full power was in their own hands, they manifested no particular inclination to extend such liberty to their opponents, and more especially *by no means to tolerate any Preacher who shall oppose that their liberty.*'—*p. liv., lv.*

We need not accumulate evidence on this point, as every tyro in English history is familiar with it, and shall therefore pass on to other topics more personal to Baillie.

He returned permanently to Scotland at the close of 1646, and devoted the remainder of his life, except on one occasion, to the duties of his college, or the proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts. The state of affairs in England had now undergone considerable change. Hampden and Pym were dead, the army was new modelled, the field of Naseby had placed the power of the state in the hands of Cromwell, and the king himself was a prisoner. The sectaries were in consequence free from molestations, and the presbyterian members of parliament were coerced into silence by their own soldiery. To the last of these events Baillie alludes in the fifth letter contained in this volume, under date of July 13, 1647. The letter is valuable, as shewing the disposition of the Scotch to arm for the monarch whom they had so stoutly opposed. They hated episcopacy and had fought

against the king as its patron and enforcer, but they regarded independency and Cromwell with all the bitterness of disappointed hope, added to the fierceness of ecclesiastical intolerance. The letter is addressed to William Spang.

' These matters of England are so extremely desperate, that now twyse they have made me sick: except God arise, all is gone there. The imprudence and cowardice of the better part of the City and Parliament, which was triple or sextuple the greater, has permitted a company of silly rascalles, which calls themselves yet no more than fourteen thousand, horse and foot, to make themselves masters of the King, and Parliament, and City, and by them of all England; so that now that disgraced Parliament is but a committee to act all at their pleasure, and the City is ready to fright the parliament at every first or second boast from the army. No humane hope remaines but in the King's unparalleled willfulness, and the armie's unmeasurable pride. As yet they are not agreed, and some writes they are not like to agree: for in our particular I expect certainly they will agree weel enough, at what distance soever their affections and principles stand. All-wayes if the finger of God in their spirits should so farr dement them as to disagree, I would think there were yet some life in the play; for I know the body of England are overwearie long agoe of the Parliament, and ever hated the sectaries, but much more now for this their unexpected treacherie and oppression. On the other part, the King is much pitied and desyred; so if they give him not contentment, he will overthrow them. If he and they agree, our hands are bound: we will be able, in our present posture and humour of our highly distracted people, to doe nothing; and whom shall we goe to help, when none calls but the king? Parliament and City, as their masters command, are ready to declare against us if we should offer to arme: but if the King would call, I doubt not of riseing of the best armie ever we had, for the crushing of these serpents, enemies to God and man.'—pp. 9, 10.

The growing alienation of the Scotch from the English parliament led to a secret treaty termed *The Engagement* between the royalists of the two kingdoms: and a proposal to send an army into England in the summer of 1648 was carried by a small majority. ' Such an enterprise,' as Mr. Laing remarks, ' placed this country in a false position. Hitherto the cause for which Scotland had been contending was to secure the purity and freedom of religious worship, but by such interference the contest assumed a different character, and was in direct opposition to the spirit and tenour of the solemn league. The expedition was strongly opposed by Argyle and others of the nobility, and a great part of the nation, upon the ground either that it was a violation of the treaties with England, or that the king having refused to give an absolute assent to the covenant or to agree to the continuance of presbytery in England for a longer period than three years, they could not support him on such terms.

David Leslie and the most experienced officers likewise refused to act unless the church was satisfied.' The result of the expedition is well known. Instead of averting, it hastened the doom of the infatuated monarch, by disclosing to the English leaders his intrigues, and informing them of the dangers to which they were exposed from their former allies. The execution of the king followed in January, and was announced by Baillie, together with the proclamation of Charles II., to his correspondent, Spang, under date of February 7th, 1649. 'One act of our lamentable tragedy being ended, we are entering,' he remarks, 'again upon the scene.' He reports, a messenger, Sir Joseph Douglas, having proceeded to the Hague to inform the prince of their proceedings, and the intention of the Estates 'speedily to send an honourable commission' to him. Hopes are expressed, not unmixed, however, with many fears, that Charles would be induced to subscribe the *Covenant*, and the utmost confidence is expressed in a unanimous movement in his favour, in case of his doing so.

'If his Majestie may be moved to joyne with us in this one point, he will have all Scotland readie to sacrifice their lives for his service. If he refuse or shift this duety, his best and most usefull friends, both here and elsewhere, will be cast into inextricable labyrinths, we fear, for the ruine of us all. We know Satan will not want ill instruments to keep him off from a tymeous yielding to this our most earnest and necessare desyre; bot as it is and will be one of all Scotland's strong petitions to God, to dispose his heart to doe his duty without delay, so we will acknowledge ourselves much obliedged to any, whom the Lord may honor, to be the happie instruments of his persuasion.'—p. 66.

Baillie was one of the commissioners appointed to wait on Charles, at the Hague, whither they proceeded in March, and his speech on the occasion has been preserved. He designates the execution of the king an 'execrable and tragick parricide,' and informed his royal listener, in the name of the parties whom he represented, that 'though all men on earth should passe over unquestioned, yet we nothing doubt but the great judge of the world will arise and plead against every one, of what condition soever, who have been either authors, or actors, or consenters, or approvers, of that hardly expressible crime, which stamps and stigmatizes, with a new and before unseen character of infamy, the face of the whole generation of sectaries and their adherents from whose hearts and hands that vilest villany did proceed.'

The commissioners returned without having accomplished their object, and it would have been well both for Scotland and England if no other overtures had been made. Such, however, was not the view of the party now dominant in the Scotch

councils, and the expedition of Charles, with the battles of Dunbar and Worcester were the consequence.

Cromwell was now master of both kingdoms, and it must be acknowledged that, if he did not carry out the patriotic professions of his earlier and better days, he yet acted with a magnanimous forbearance towards his enemies. No other ruler is worthy to be compared with him in this respect, and it constitutes a redeeming feature of his administration which ought not to be forgotten. It was his policy, as Mr. Laing admits, ‘to leave the church very much to its own guidance,’ and the ordinary meetings of Presbyteries and Synods were therefore unmolested. The General Assembly, however, was a dangerous body, capable of exerting—and heartily disposed to do so—a strong political influence against his government. Its dissolution was therefore resolved on, and the following letter to Mr. Calamy, of London, dated July 27, 1653, gives an account of the manner in which this resolution was effected.

‘ At this time, I have no more to adde, bot this one word, to let yow know, That on the 20th of July last, when our Generall Assemblie wes sett in the ordinarie tyme and place, Lieutenant-Colonel Cotterall besett the Church with some ratteſ of musqueteirs and a troup of horse; himself (after our fast, wherein Mr. Dickson and Mr. Dowglass had two gracious sermons,) entered the Assemblie-house, and, immeadiately after Mr. Dickson, the Moderator, his prayer, required audience; wherein he inquired, If we did sitt there by the authority of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England? or of the Commanders-in-Chiefe of the English forces? or of the English Judges in Scotland? The Moderator replyed, That we were ane Ecclesiasticall synod, ane Spirituall court of Jesus Christ, which medled not with anything Civile; that our authoritie wes from God, and established by the Lawes of the land yet standing unrepealed; that, by the Solemn League and Covenant, the most of the English army stood obliedged to defend our Generall Assemblie. When some speeches of this kind had passed, the Lieutenant-Colonell told us, his order wes to dissolve us; whereupon he commanded all of us to follow him, else he would drag us out of the rowme. When we had entered a Protestation of this unheard of and unexampled violence, we did ryse and follow him; he ledd us all through the whole streets a myle out of the towne, encompassing us with foot-companys of musqueteirs, and horsemen without; all the people gazing and mourning as at the saddest spectacle they had ever seen. When he had ledd us a myle without the towne, he then declared what further he had in commission, That we should not dare to meet any more above three in number; and that against eight o’clock tomorrow, we should depart the towne, under paine of being guiltie of breaking the publick peace: And the day following, by sound of trumpet, we were commanded off towne under the paine of present imprisonment. Thus our Generall Assemblie, the glory and strength of our Church upon earth, is, by your souldiarie, crushed and trod under

foot, without the least provocatione from us, at this time, either in word or deed. For this our hearts are sadd, our eyes runn downe with water, we sigh to God against whom we have sinned, and wait for the help of his hand; bot from those who oppressed us we deserve no evill.'—pp. 225, 226.

Want of space must limit us to one more extract, which we take from a letter addressed to Spang, and dated May 12, 1662. Our readers are aware of the part acted by the Presbyterians, both Scotch and English, in the restoration of the Stuarts. Nothing could be more ill-judged or reckless than their course, and they suffered bitterly for it. The dupes of a too-confiding credulity, they were laughed at and spurned by the men whom they had handed into power. It was not long before they found out their mistake, and the irreligion, profanity, and licentiousness which spread over the land as locusts, bore witness of their folly. Baillie gives the following account of affairs immedately subsequent to the restoration:—

'The publick affaires yow know them as well and better than I. Our Kirk, all the English tymes, had been very faithfull to our King, and so instrumentall as we could for his restitution. We had lost much blood at Dunbar, Worcester, and elsewhere, and at last our libertie, in his cause. We did firmly expect, at his Restitution, a comfortable subsistence to ourselves, and all our Presbyterian brethren, in all the dominions; and believe the King's intention was no other; but, by divine permission, other counsells thereafter prævailed, and now carry all. When the King [was] at Breda, it was said he was not averse from establishing the Presbytery; nor was the contrare peremptorily resolved till the Saturday at night, in the cabbin-councell at Canterbury. At the beginning it went on softly; Calamy, Baxter, Manton, Reynold, were made chaplains: but at once it altered. This did come from our supine negligence and unadvercence; for the Parliament, then consisting of the secluded members, the Citie, Monck also, and the Armie, were for us: Had we but petitioned for Presbytrie at Breda, it had been, as was thought, granted; but fearing what the least delay of the King's coming over might have produced, and trusting fully to the King's goodness, we hastened him over, without any provision for our safetie. At that time it was, that Dr. Sheldon now Bishop of London, and Dr. Morley, did poyson Mr. Sharp, our agent, whom we trusted; who, peice and peice, in so cunning a way, hes trepanned us, as we have never win so much as to petition either King, Parliament, or Councell. My Lord Hyde [is] the great Minister of State who guided all, and to whom, at his lodging in Worcester house, the King weekly, and ofter, uses to resort and keep counsell with him alone some hours; and so, with the King, Mr. Sharp became more intimate than any man almost of our nation. It seemes he hes undertaken to doe in our Church that which now he has performed easily, and is still in acting.'

'The Parliament of England did all things for the King he pleased;

augmented much his revenue beyond what any King in England ever had. After some conferences at Worcester-house, betwixt the Bishops and a few of the Presbyterians, where it was hoped his Majestie would bring the Bishops to a great condescension, at last it was found they would yield in as good as nothing; so the House of Commons formed a Bill of Uniformity, that all should be put from their charges who did not conforme to the Bishops' orders. On this the House of Lords did make some demurre, and yet does; but we doubt not of their agreeance to it at last; and from thenceforth a fearfull persecution is expected, for the prevalent part of the Episcopall faction are imbibed, and, both in doctrine and practice, it seems, fully of the old Canterbury stamp. God be merciful to our brethren, who hes no help of man, nor any refuge but in God alone: We fear our case shall be little better.'—pp. 484—486.

Baillie did not long survive the penning of this letter. He died in August, 1662, having just foreseen the evil which was coming on his country, but being mercifully spared from the sufferings which many of his brethren were destined to endure.

Of the edition of his *Letters and Journals* now before us, we have already spoken in terms of well-merited eulogy. It comprises all which can be desired, either by the admirers of Baillie or the student of British history. To an extended *Appendix*, consisting of original letters and papers, illustrative of ecclesiastical affairs, it adds a copious *Index* and a *Glossary* of obsolete words. The Bannatyne Club has rendered an important service by the publication, which we shall be glad to see imitated by other kindred associations.

Art. IX. *The Quarterly Review for December. 1842.*

As a sermon without a text is but a homily, and the homily, though not the prayer-book, age has passed away, we shall adopt as our text on the present occasion, the following peroration, with which the 'Quarterly Review' closed its December number:—

'We have shown that these Societies (the League and its auxiliaries) set out with a public and fundamental engagement to act by *legal and constitutional means*; but that, on the contrary, all their proceedings have been in the highest degree unconstitutional, and to the common sense of mankind, illegal.

'We have shown that their second fundamental engagement, that *no party political discussion should be allowed at any of their meetings*, has been scandalously violated, and that the language of their speeches and their press has been not merely *violent* and indecent, but incendiary and seditious.

'We have shown that even from the outset, they endeavoured to menace the government and the legislature with the pressure of *physical force*, and that these threats continued with increasing violence till lost at length in the tumult of the actual outbreak which they had provoked.

'We have shown that the *magistrates* who belonged to these societies, instead of maintaining the peace and tranquillity of their respective jurisdictions, were amongst the most prominent and violent promoters of every species of agitation; and that while all of them talked language and promulgated doctrines that endangered the public peace, some of the highest in authority volunteered declarations, which those inclined to disturb the public peace might reasonably consider as promises of, at least, impunity.

'We have shown that the League have spent, according to their own statement, 90,000*l.* in the last year, we know not exactly how, but clearly in furtherance of the unconstitutional, illegal, and dangerous practices which we have detailed.

'We have shown, we think, abundant reason to conclude that the 50,000*l.* which they are now endeavouring to raise, is probably destined to the same, or perhaps still more illegal, unconstitutional, and dangerous practices.

'We have shown that, from first to last, their system has been one of falsehood and deception, from their original fundamental imposture of being the advocates of the *poor*, down to the meaner shifts of calling brutal violence, freedom of discussion, and a subscription for feeding sedition and riot, a fund for education or charity.

'And finally, we hope we have shown that no man of common sense, of any party, if he only adheres to the general principles of the British constitution, can hesitate to pronounce the existence of such associations, raising money, exciting mobs, organized, and to use a term of the same Jacobin origin as their own, *affiliated*, for the avowed purpose of coercing the government and the legislature, can hesitate, we say, to pronounce the existence of such associations disgraceful to our national character, and wholly incompatible either with the internal peace and commercial prosperity of the country, or, in the highest meaning of the words, THE SAFETY OF THE STATE.'

Now, from this array of illatives, one would imagine that the 'Quarterly Review' had gone through a patient and candid analysis of the official acts of the League, from its origin to the close of 1842; that its objects had been clearly collated with the means employed for their attainment; that the arguments and facts adduced by the Leaguers for the repeal of the Corn Laws, had been met by the solid refutation of other facts; and that a philosophical exposure had been made of the fallacies on which the opinions of the repealers are founded. But if any reader of this quotation should take the trouble to examine that remarkable tirade of which it forms the close, what would be his indignation to find that the whole paper was a studied

avoidance of the *το μεγιστον* of the controversy, and a mere interchange of every term of denunciation and violence that could be culled from the English vocabulary. That such, and such only, is this memorable review of the proceedings of the League, we boldly refer the most prejudiced supporter of the Corn Laws to the article itself in proof.

Whether the Corn Laws are answerable for the present distress of the people, the reviewer does not appear to trouble himself to inquire; equally careless is he of the arguments and facts with which the League enforces the repeal. Questions of machinery are slightly touched upon indeed, for the purpose of reproaching the cotton lords with a desire to produce as much, and as cheaply as they can; but the main stream of the reviewer's rage runs against the *seditious language* of the multifarious speakers of the League. Lord Kinnaird is soundly rated for having declared that the League does not advocate doctrines of civil force. The dissenting ministers, as was to be expected, are loaded with every opprobrious epithet, and are jeered at for having responded to the call of a Mr. George Thompson. Every grotesque simile or inept expression that fell from the speakers in the heat of debate; handbills and tracts which the League never published, the random phrases that fell from men most unskilled in public addresses; Lord John Russell and Colonel Thompson, Duffy the Chartist, and Mr. Higginbotham, Danton and Robespierre, the Rebellion, the famine lyric of Dr. Bowring, and Kersall Moor, are a part of the wadding that hide the

— lean proportions
Of the argument —

of the 'Quarterly Review.'

The horror, feigned or real, which has been professed at the language employed by some of the Leaguers, appears to us both unphilosophical and absurd. We are no advocates of intemperate language, neither do we admire the nerveless periods with which honourable and right honourable speakers treat the unparalleled distress of the kingdom. It is disgusting to read the unemphatic phrases which are the current terminology of parliament when a famished and pauperized people are the theme; and which afford a marvellous contrast to the violence of aristocratic diction when denouncing the sentiments of the people in the terms *sedition, insubordination, brutish, and revolutionary*, &c. The people complain of these extremes of language in parliament, and in our opinion justly: for when the glaring and countless wrongs of the nation are mentioned, it is in the civil style of the merest common place; but if the demands of the masses for redress are started, the cold and colourless phrases of

aristocratic oration are changed into big and pompous phraseology, where the standing forms of expression, ‘the honour and dignity of the crown,’ ‘the glory of the constitution,’ &c., roll forth in gallant volubility amidst the cheers of the House.

Most of the speakers at the meetings of the League are fresh men, forced by the power of distress into the unwonted post of public speakers: they have not been hackneyed into that circumlocutory style in which the atoms of truth are lost in the whirl of complimentary and no-meaning paragraphs. They call things by their right names, and speak strongly from stout and burdened hearts that would have burst long ago but for the vast amount of public virtue that yet, thanks be to God, dwells in the national mind, a far more salient restraint than all the statutes and the military force with which they are backed. Such a style is not only natural to the speakers, but is the best: it wings the thoughts to every man's bosom; whereas, the courtly and classical phrase that is popular in parliament, is little better than so much Greek to the masses. The League speakers only imitate their parliamentary superiors, who speak strongly enough where they feel their interests at stake, and are neither chary of their ‘detestation and scorn,’ nor of their ‘horror and disgust,’ when they refer to sentiments that tend to open the eyes of the sufferers to their own affairs. *Strong, and very strong language, we admit, has been applied by the advocates of free trade to the Corn Laws and their upholders; but not more strong than much of the aristocratic phrase which has been employed to denounce almost every popular measure that has been wrung from parliament.* Language is of necessity plus or minus, as the mind of the speaker; and as there are many exceptions, among the members of parliament, to the intemperate style of Brougham, Exeter, Lyndhurst, Sibthorpe, Ferrand, Roebuck, *cum multis aliis*, so are there among the speakers of the Anti-Corn Law League. But we neither blame the strong language of aristocratic nor of plebeian speakers, provided it is not a breach of the personal civilities due to all men. Really intemperate language seldom does public harm, but recoils as a punishment on its author. Yet it is to the strong, and not to the toothless style of speech that the world owes all its progressions. The first orators of all times and countries live in the iron monuments of their own style, while the waxen race of elegant declaimers melts from the world, and is justly forgotten.

We quite concur with our wrathful contemporary, that the language of the Anti-Corn Law League is both extraordinary and vehement: alike potent in its sway of the public mind, and prognostic of coming events. Epithets are applied by the speakers of the League, both to their opponents and to the

different *gravamina* of the Corn Law, which we would rather had been spared; but our defence of the terminology of the repealers must be sought in the magnitude of the legislative crimes they denounce, and in the appalling scenes of incipient famine which they portray. If the authors and orators in the service of the League are to speak the words of truth and soberness, their phraseology, however measured, *must* be thoroughly impassioned; for what other would embody the truths that are to be told on this subject, and the facts that 'swell to heaven'? On the authority of committees of parliament, the Corn Laws compel the people of Great Britain to pay 50,000,000*l.* per annum more for their food than they need do; and this sum levied as a monopoly instead of a duty, flows into the pockets of the landlords. Now would any more adequate word than *plunder* convey a just idea of this wholesale system of wrongful acquisition of the popular wealth? Would impolicy or unjust gain, would oppression, or even tyranny, be terms adequately representative of the facts? We maintain, not; and the best style of expounding public evils is to call things by their right names, the more especially as the masses are persons who understand this style, and to whom the modes of subdued expression current among unemphatic and heartless aristocratic speakers must be pure mystery.

The ministers of religion proclaim through the land the retrograde morality of the people, induced by the extreme poverty consequent on the ruin of trade. Would soft terms, and gentle insinuations become the servants of the most high God in such a crisis? One part of the people are passing into the poor-house; another, into the police courts or the grave; a third, into foreign countries; while capital is wasted by millions, and the middle classes are falling into rapid decay; places of worship, with their schools, are half deserted; the cottages of the poor are ransacked by distress, and our small bankrupt courts are crowded with debtors, yet we are gravely taunted with the vehement language of the sufferers and their friends! Out upon such heartless *finesse*. To this shrouding of the truth by softly flowing oratory much of the mischief is attributable, and certainly the long continuance of the odious tyranny of these Corn Laws.

But the violent declamations of the aristocracy against the violent language of the Leaguers, involves more than a question of taste. The *de gustibus non disputandum* rule, applied even to such styles as those of Lord Ellenborough, Dr. Chalmers, Coleridge, or Edward Irving, soon disposes of the extreme anomalies of individual taste; and the same rule, with a grain of candour, would be amply sufficient to settle the question of style peculiar to the antagonists of the Corn Law. But

this language is power; and with its exercise the ‘Quarterly’ labours to connect the late strike in the Northern counties, though in so doing it refutes its own fallacies. Language is but ‘the outward and visible sign of thought, and it is as impossible to speak in a style like the cold but beautiful crystals of frost when the soul is on fire, as it would be for a man to make his shadow different from himself. Strong language is not only natural, but politic; all revolutions owe to it their being and fashion. Oratory and poetry are but variations of strong language. Every man, not excepting even this reviewer, uses it to the best of his ability when he has any great interest at stake; and the lover, the felon, and the premier, are no fonder of vapid terminology than the democratic speaker; nay, even the philosopher uses the strongest language when he writes on a subject for which he cares a straw. It is only when we advocate the cause in which we have no interest, or of the importance of which we are but half convinced, that nature permits us to waive the use of strong terms.

The National Anti-Corn Law League, as all parties must confess, is a very extraordinary confederacy. It owes its existence to no political party—it exists and grows in spite of their opposition. It is the creature of commerce alone. Its first publications were thought no better than trash; its first meetings had scarcely a locality; its first members were unknown beyond their towns, and even there were thought to be little better than a club of humane enthusiasts, revelling in visions of an era that was thought not even potential, and, if practicable, not to be wished for. Its data were supposed to be too recondite for the multitude, who might occasionally hear of its tea parties and speeches, but who took less interest in such scenes than in the ribboned procession of a St. Patrick’s day. At some of these almost unknown meetings, a young man of quiet demeanour occasionally made speeches, which struck the more sagacious as happy specimens of clear-headed argument; but nothing further was then thought of Richard Cobden, who is now at the head of a vast organization of public opinion, which has covered the land with its lecturers and tracts, and divides, with the Parliament of Great Britain, the attention of millions. Such is the power of a truth and the progress of an opinion!

The League *is*, in truth, the rival of the English parliament, and represents more truly the wealth, the intellect, the numbers, the interests of commerce, religion, and education, than either of the legislative houses, which may well feel jealous of its existence. The parliament represents the spirit of aristocracy. It is, with few exceptions, composed of men who have never worked for their living; they are full, and have need of nothing, except the heart of nature’s nobility. They have no sympathy with

the democratic world; their universe is one of court days, feudal halls, sumptuous picture-galleries, dinner-parties, and race-courses; and watering-places, titles, and every inane species of barbaric insignia, seem to be the scope of their being. They trace their dignities to savage barons and belted knights; they enjoy a monopoly of royal favours, of places, and pensions, and patronage; they infinitely admire the things of the past, but look with fear upon that onward progress of society to which all their sympathies are alien. The League boasts of no antiquity; it is the gourd that has sprung up in a night for the protection and comfort of the scorched and wasted children of sorrow; it is backed by no laws of parliament; it has not even a sentinel to do duty before its Patagonian Halls; it has neither vergers nor black rod men, nor mace, nor club-houses, nor offices of emolument to prevent the zeal of its members from flagging. It neither promises itself perpetuity, nor proposes to become 'a fifth estate.' It owns itself to be ephemeral, the child of the day, and proposes its own dissolution the day the Corn Laws are blotted from the statutes, *and before this nothing, except its own folly, can destroy it.*

As different as the belligerent parties in parliament, so are their leaders. Mr. Cobden and Sir Robert Peel, though both new men, and risen from the multitude, have met a strange obliquity of destiny; the son of the farmer becoming the champion of free trade, while the polished heir of a cotton spinner, who derived his fortune from trade, passes to the head of the monopolists of land. What a humiliating sight to the noble and ancient houses of Derby, Lansdowne, Spencer, Warwick, Wentworth, Stafford, &c. &c., that the captaincy of the great pitched battle between the interests of oligarchy and those of the people who live by trade should fall into such hands; another added to the countless proofs of the intellectual poverty of aristocracy, whose vaunted *natale numen* and education do not produce the incentive to genius with which trade anoints from her impartial cornucopia the heads of her toiling masses. Cobden, destitute of the personal exterior that ministered so much to the oratory of Chatham, Burke, and Fox, has one of the least impassioned styles. He is earnest, but not intense, simple as childhood, but never dull; straightforward, but never vulgar; he abounds in the *argumentum ad hominem et ex concessso*, but is never vituperative; never subtle, but always acute; at no time profound, but always sagacious; more bullied than any, except O'Connell, but never worsted in the parry; inexhaustible in quotation of well-proved facts which appeal to the common judge in every man's bosom, and indomitably true to their legitimate induction. He derives none of his power from the influence

of the landlord, or from great property acquired by trade. With such a lack of what has always been thought indispensable to party success, Mr. Cobden has yet risen, in two or three sessions, to contest the championship with the premier, experienced in parliamentary tactics for thirty years ; and he represents more fairly the sentiments of a greater number of her Majesty's subjects than perhaps any other member of parliament.

How different is Sir Robert Peel ! To the influence of great wealth, he unites that of a polished speaker, fertile in quotation and lampoon ; of studied exterior, backed by the desperate host of oligarchs ; a perfect Claudio in the plausibles ; a master of the wriggling argument, exquisitely polished even to the little end of nothing ; *au fait* in all the secrets of court and ministerial shuffle, prompt at clap trap, proud of being thought impartial, punctilious in preserving the forms of the house, weathered in all its climates, familiar with every offset to the popular cause, and honoured by four monarchs. Sir Robert Peel has been fondled at the feet of the great lions of despotism, the familiar of dukes and marquesses, curtseyed to by their ladies, petted by the parsons, noticed by foreign potentates, quoted as an authority of taste, the mender of criminal codes and currency bills, the patron of many that are now high at the bar and the church, the Divus Dis, in his silver armour, always awake, but always reserved ; several times premier before, while once the nation had to halt till he had galloped from Rome ! Yet what a stripling he proves himself beside Richard Cobden !

This difficulty, however, might be borne awhile, if it were not for a greater, and one created by the premier himself. What is he to do with his own principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market ? It is too plain to be withheld, and too brief to be mystified. It is too simple to be treated as a metaphor, and was uttered on too grave an occasion to have been the *lapsus loquendi* of a heated debater. Explanation it neither wants nor admits, for while such was the text of the premier, his correspondent paraphrase of the tariff avenges the sense. What is good for the goslings must be better for the geese. The same principle, if good, in a few applications, must be better as it is amplified, and best only when it has been equitably and fairly carried to its full consequences. This is all that free trade demands, and it quotes no author so apt as Sir Robert Peel. 'This gentleman will be judged by his peers ;' he owns no authority but himself ; we are content, and relinquish all others, if he will abide by his own words. What will the premier then do ? Recede he cannot, nor stand still. The principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market is one

of progression ; and therefore equally adapted to the laws of mental development and the wants of society. A hundred years hence, commerce will rejoice in the maxim, while it is clear that the history of trade is nothing more than a pursuit of advantage under the guidance of this one rule.

The *Causes* of these remarkable men are equally dissimilar. That of monopoly depends on the infinitely-tangled lacework of private interest ; it appeals to no higher morality than Acts of Parliament ; it calls the glittering tenants of the West End, the people of England ; and it depends alone on the army and the majority of the House of Commons. It prates of terror and love of change, and quotes the extravagances of our Commonwealth and the Revolution of France. It is admirable at the use of the *cum hoc, ergo propter hoc* style of argument, and insists on the glory which England has acquired under the present system. It makes gorgon heads of possible times of dearth, and reckons the casualty of ‘ all the world conspiring to starve England,’ a sufficient reason, against the repeal. It talks of the immoral tendency of the manufacturing system, and dotes through tears of admiration on a virtuous yeomanry who do not exist, and on a peaceable peasantry who rejoice in potatoes. But it *never appeals to common sense nor Scripture* ; it quotes no facts to prove its theory, and reposes with sleek apathy in the resolve—*nolumus leges Angliae mutare.*

The cause of the League may be expressed in the sinewy phrase of Knox, “ *the immutabel righteousesse offe the invincibil Godde:*” for we regard the abstract principle of right and wrong on which the opposition to the Corn Laws is based, to be the true secret of its strength. Next to the abstract justice part of the question, comes the appeal to mercy ; an auxiliary worthy of the principal motive for entire repeal of the taxes on food. And if anything more were necessary to enforce justice on a selfish body of legislators who have no more sympathy with the masses of the people than with the marauding desperadoes of Hyderabad, it is to be found in the unanswerable array of facts and figures, which committees of the House of Commons and committees of the League have unwittingly united to pour upon the nation. But the resources of the League are not even thus exhausted : the demand for repeal has risen from the quiet warning of a few philosophical economists to become the *vox populi*, troubling every debate in Parliament, and producing a stronger spirit of inquiry and disaffection than will coalesce with things as they are. The League has all the elements of strength which can be derived from wealth, intelligence, numbers, and popular interest ; it is the *ingens horrendum* to monopoly, without the *cui lumen ademptum.*

We repeat, the League is all-juvenescence, stalwart in limb, capacious of action, unencumbered with frivolities, undaunted of purpose, and exhaustless in its power of peaceable agitation. Every new insolvent or unemployed artisan becomes a convert to its doctrines, if he were not one before. The philosopher approves of it in his study; the preacher blesses it from the pulpit; "the hungry, and faint, and poor," look to it for temporal salvation, and nothing can stop its course but the entire repeal of the Corn Laws. Something was, however, wanted to propel the streams of the League with more effect through a certain portion of the public mind; and that propellant force has been timely given by Sir Robert Peel's assault on Mr. Cobden; and this gentleman and the League can afford to pocket the affront, and to take the premier's opportune aid as his subscription to the 50,000*l.* fund.

Of the incident to which we refer we have little to say. There can be no doubt that it was a mere enactment, dashed with something more of the adventure style than is common to 'the responsible adviser of her Majesty.' It was partly voluntary, and partly in pursuance of the scheme of diversion commenced by Ferrand in the early part of last session, but matured to greater ripeness by the seventy pages issued in December by the 'Quarterly Review.' If Mr. Cobden could be crushed, other advocates might perhaps be coaxed; at all events, it was worth the trial. A faint heart

'Ne'er won a ladie fayre,'

But what are we to think of the conduct of a portion of the daily press, which lent itself to the base partisanship of the monopolist, and but faintly repelled the slanderers of the League? What becomes of the long-vaunted liberty of the press, if its pages can be thus easily obtained for the service of faction? The premier, in a fit of spleen, fell rabidly on Mr. Cobden for reminding him of his responsibility: and the press ought to have echoed that doctrine through the length and breadth of the land. Instead of doing this, however, it assaulted the Rev. Mr. Bayley for quoting an anecdote as *a sign of the times*; and endeavoured, from Mr. Cobden's honourable refusal to repudiate Mr. Bayley, to establish a complicity between these two gentlemen and the murderous madman M'Naughton; a species of logic similar to that of the satirist who attempted to prove that because butter was not salt, therefore it must be gunpowder! By all means let the monopolists renew the assault on the League and its friends; nothing can be more opportune for its funds, lectures, facts, and appeals. To Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Cobden may say, in the words of Bobadino, 'Please your honour

to abuse us roundly once a week, it is better than the gift of a thousand florins : and if the premier should reply in the words of his honour, ‘ I will, Bobadino, for a share of the gain,’ Mr. Cobden can afford to strike the bargain.

To the malignant opponents of the Conservative party its position yields no small amount of merriment. It is of Divine arrangement that the sequences of moral actions often follow their agents, even in the present life. To punish a selfish course of legislation, from this law, has arisen the League, from which it will require more skill and mortification to escape than it would have done to have acted justly at first. The League is the child of the Corn Laws ; hampered by the force without, which this doughty offspring has raised against its parent, and baffled within Parliament by its cause and appeals, what can the monopolists do ? The ‘ Quarterly Review ’ has sported seventy pages to prove that the acts of the League are seditious, and its constitution illegal. Why, then, in the name of common sense not suppress it ?

‘ ‘Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished !’

If unconstitutional, by all means suppress it. But who shall ‘ cast the first stone ?’ Is no Curtius to be found among the senators ? Is there no genius of the *Dewsbury Devil order* in the Lords who will go to the rescue of lachrymose monopoly ? Let a call of the House be made, and let the lots be given to the Spartans, and it may be, Mammon will overrule the ostracism, when the business will be achieved, and the breath of the oligarchs may again respire unoppressed ! But what then ? Why, the League, of course, will fall like a bed of tulips in a thunder storm ! Cobden will creep back to his factory, and the tons of Corn Law speeches and tracts will be sold to the hucksters to wrap up soap, and candles, and blue. The perspective is all sunshine afterwards ; by all means, therefore, suppress the League.

But what if our vaticinations should fail ? Let the remedy be tried, and brave hearts task themselves to the height of the maxim—

‘ Dii sua bona laboribus vendunt.’

It may be, however, in this ‘ life of hazard,’ that the escapade against the League might fail ; that Hydra, as one head was destroyed, might raise a hundred to avenge the affront done to its shoulders. It is possible that if the League were suppressed at Manchester, another would start up in Liverpool, a second in Glasgow, a third in Bristol, and the *πολλοι* in the other chief towns of the realm, while a metropolitan Briareus might arise

in Palace Yard! ‘All things are possible to him that believeth,’ and this *might be* the result of suppressing the League. What then? Let us look at the alternative. The League *must* be suppressed or left alone; for Sir Robert Peel has declared his determination at present not to repeal the Corn Laws. The ‘Quarterly Review’ attributes to the League the late turn-out in Lancashire, and Sir Robert Peel has played Act the first in the ‘Bombastes Furioso’ in Parliament, to the dismay of his friends and the jeers and indignation of his enemies. Are these things to continue? They must, except he suppress the League. This formidable antagonist collects taxes without an Act of Parliament, builds palaces for its meetings, sends its lecturers into every village, controls a number of periodicals, reads lectures to Conservative landlords in Parliament on the state of their tenants, is blessed by millions every morning, and dilates through every day into new magnitude. The rude and ungentlemanly deportment of the premier to Mr. Cobden acted at once as a safety valve to his own heart, and as inspiration to that of millions of her Majesty’s subjects, who respond to the scene of cajolery, by addresses to Mr. Cobden. The prying finger of the League has at length detected the gangrenous spot that cannot bear even the touch of ‘a Sussex farmer’s son.’ The Doctor *must*, however, and *will* examine that part again, at whatever cost to the feelings of the sufferer. What can avert the question of responsibility, but the suppression of the League, or the repeal of the Corn Laws? We have often enough been flouted with the phrase, ‘the responsible advisers of the Crown.’ To whom are they, then, responsible?—the Crown only? But the Crown itself is responsible both by the law of nature and by the constitution, to the people, or the compact between Sovereign and subjects is the most insolent farce ever trumped up to juggle a cheated people. The League, then, preaches the orthodoxy of the constitution, and it must continue to expound the doctrine, except it be suppressed.

Nor does the League wish for the removal, at least, it ought not, of the premier from office; for he has certainly done more to expedite the ultimate freedom of trade from the chains of the aristocracy, than any prime minister selected from the Whigs could have done. Whether he be at heart a free-trader, and from policy remains within the aristocratic circle, to warm and expand its atmosphere, or whether impelled solely by his convictions of commercial truth, he utters them, blind or reckless of the consequences, it is certain that he has enunciated doctrines which will never coalesce with the retention of the Corn Laws. The same sentiments uttered by Lord Russell might

have been received with cold assent, if not with jeers, while the thoughtless majority in Parliament now applaud the truth that we must buy in the cheapest, and sell in the dearest market, *as if the orthodox sentiment* should be accepted by the people as a substitute for the repeal. The Leaguers and the premier are agreed upon the axioms; by all means, then, let him continue in office, and be forced to the *quod erit demonstrandum*, or the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Sir Robert Peel is a marvellous man; a polished 'Simon Little' in himself, he is yet the keeper of all the magnates of the Conservative cause, who are almost as invisible in his presence, as the moons of Jupiter at noon. Where is my Lord Stanley, the Hotspur of former fields? The Chancellor of the Exchequer might be no more, for the little that is seen or even heard of him, except when in some squabble, he appears at the magistrate's office to swear his life against a discarded subaltern! The great Captain himself is sunk to a secondary—a sort of gentleman-lackey of the Cabinet. Lord Lyndhurst has not even cracked a cap. The gay and agile riflemen of former days—where are they? The fusileers and sappers, the scouts and foragemen of the Conservative party in Parliament—where are they? Sir Robert Peel might have eaten them all up, and rejoicing in the various gifts imparted by such aliment, thus account for his sustaining the war single-handed, and doing at once the work of miner, gunner, corporal, fifer, and gibbeteer. By what lullaby has he hushed these dearies to slumber? and from what narcotic do they sleep so soundly and so long? Perhaps not an egotist naturally, his position makes him appear superlatively so. 'The curve line,' said Hogarth, 'is the test of beauty,' and so said Baldini of the straight line, to which we rather incline in political matters,—for all things begin, continue, and close with the premier in the mighty I, reminding one of the old ditty—

‘I, by myself, I,
Can talk to the little fly,
Speak to the lavrac that he hie,
Cause matrons waste and maidens die,
Teach knights to fight, or hounds to lie,
Or spoor your dreams and tell you why,
Drive death off, or bring him nigh,
I, by myself, I.’

Such is the potent versatility of the premier's genius. He is the valorous all-in-all of the Cabinet, and the more wonderful is his all-present activity when we remember that he sustains the burden alone, save the occasional services of the renegade Sir James Graham, and the wrath of the member for Bath.

If some of the statements of the 'Quarterly Review' were of

too ribald a character to produce any other effect than to show the ungovernable passion of the writer, the charge made against the League of spending 90,000*l.* in one year, demands a graver reply. The reviewer, aware of the all-potent *argumentum ad denarium*, and of the just and universal scandal that falls on those who misappropriate the public money, affects to compare the expenditure of the League with its income, and tauntingly inquires ‘what public proceedings of the League can account for a tithe of the expenditure?’ It proceeds to reply. ‘We know not, but we know, as everybody knows, that within the specified period there happened two public events in which the League took a great interest—the general election in 1841, and the general turn-out in 1842—and until the League shall give (which never it has done since January 1840) some detailed account of its expenditure, we shall be justified in suspecting that the general election, to say nothing of some separate contests since, and the general turn-out, have had something to do with the disappearance of the 90,000*l.*’ These shameless assumptions of the League’s income by its enemies are thus refuted by Mr. Cobden :—

‘ Gross exaggerations have appeared as to the sum of money which has already been spent by the council of the League. About 25,000*l.* is the amount which has passed through our hands during the last four years, of which I think full seven-eighths have been raised in Manchester and the neighbourhood. We calculate that about three times this sum has been expended by the local associations, and by individuals throughout the kingdom, in petitions, printing, deputations, meetings, &c. Or, in round numbers, probably 100,000*l.* may have been expended in the past agitation of the question. You may have observed that the *Standard* newspaper, mistaking the 100,000*l.* mentioned in our address to mean the expenditure of the Manchester Council of the League, has put down its own estimate of our expenditure at 15,000*l.*, and inquires very gravely for the balance.’

As to the appropriation of the income of the League to election purposes, the same gentleman observes, in a letter to the chairman of the Liverpool Association—

‘ You may have seen, in some of the monopolist papers, accusations made against the League of having paid my election expenses, and those of other free trade candidates. I merely notice it to add a fact. At the memorable contest for Walsall, when our president, Mr. Smith, stood on anti-corn-law principles, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone, an application was made from that borough to the League for pecuniary assistance. An extraordinary general meeting of the council was called, and, at the most numerous meeting ever held, a unanimous vote was passed, refusing the aid, and repudiating the principle of voting any money from the funds of the League for election contests. That resolution has been faithfully adhered to.’

The second insinuation, that the funds of the repealers went to procure the turn-out of 1842 is less deserving of serious reply. An election certainly never occurs without expense, as the subscribers to that Corn Law League, the Carlton Club, know. How many members of parliament, election agents, attorneys, editors, clerks, and justices of the peace, owe to that Catalinian treasury their rise and fall, possibly we shall never know. We offer our contemporary a fair challenge, to furnish, for the next number of the 'Quarterly Review,' every item of the expenditure of the League from its origin, if it will only publish *the expenditure of the Carlton Club for the last three years!* If the challenge be refused, we might urge the *lex talionis* as a justification of the National Anti-Corn Law League not publishing its accounts. But there is no need of secrecy. The world not merely *may*, but will see how the past and future levies of the League are appropriated. But surely no great amount was necessary to produce a strike! The movements of the operative class are generally cheap to the public, as the principal cost of strikes are paid by the minus wages of the operatives. Did the League keep open taverns, or dole out soup, or bread and beer? Did it fee the leaders of the workmen, who have done all they could to embroil its acts with their own indictments? Did not the turn-outs take the side of wages against the Leaguers, whom they were instigated by O'Connor and his partisans to regard as a combination against labour. In what imaginable mode could any part of the alleged 90,000*l.* be expended, either in raising the strike, or conducting its operations, or in putting an end to its alarming movements? The government has been aided by the Chartists in searching for evidence to convict the League of complicity in the strike, yet where are the discoveries? If the power of the League were as all pervading as the 'Quarterly' alleges, it is passing strange that its creature, the multitude, never for a moment acknowledged its sway, but divided forthwith into two different bodies—one claiming the Charter, and the other the fair day's wages! By the ordinary rules of demonology, we are told that he only who raises the ghost can control its motions or allay its ire; but here the law egregiously commits trespass upon itself. The League raises the spirit of sedition, which was no sooner up than it turned its malignant powers on its *invocantes*. Strange neophytes were these 'Russell magistrates,' and not even cunning withal; for against the goblins they had called from the vasty deep 'to coerce the government,' they had not provided for their own safety!

We can tell the 'Quarterly' a secret, however, which may be worth knowing. *The League does know* that the Conservatives have disbursed considerable sums among the Chartist leaders to

effect a diversion of the working-classes, and to keep up the watchword 'The Charter,' against the cause of the repeal.

Even the women of Manchester have not escaped the ire of the reviewer, who is shocked to find 'ladies of title and the wives of merchants,' (who are sneeringly mentioned as the *femelles de ces mâles*,) engaged in a bazaar and a *soirée* on the side of the League. How long and shameless a sinister female influence has swayed in the senate, the church, the camp, and the cabinet, the reviewer does not state; nor was it either necessary or convenient. How many members of parliament, officers of the government, the army and the navy, and even the church, owe almost entirely to lady influence their present position, it is not easy either to record. Many gross instances of this nature are matters of history; but as long as 'the charming plotters' are engaged in the Conservative service, it is but 'the natural operation of uncontrollable causes.' When the ladies became the advocates of the West Indian slaves, and mixed up the question of negro freedom with their love and fire-side affairs, they were assailed, in the same spirit, and by the same division of the press that affects to be 'shocked at the impropriety of the wives and daughters' of Manchester and other great towns becoming the coadjutors of the League. The reviewer's ire proves the value of such auxiliaries; and we hope all 'the wives and daughters' of the Corn Law repealers will take the hint, and at once turn those influences which they only create and wield, to the sacred cause of patriotism and the poor. No right-hearted woman, we are told, ever failed of her purpose; and as the League proposes to coerce the government by raising the greatest power of the country—opinion—against its monopolies, it acts wisely to secure the all penetrating influence of 'the wives and daughters,' who are, at least, as much interested in the question of cheap bread and abundant labour, as the 'lords and sons of the soil.' A protest against political women is sickly nonsense; for, with individual exceptions, there is that in their nature, in all countries and times, which prevents their becoming politicians; but there are certain powers of conquest inalienable in the softer sex, whether they sit

'Simply chatting in a rustic row,'

or, 'winding the distaff,' or, 'teaching the young idea how to shoot,' of which the League does well to avail itself. The only disgrace attaches to the government, that makes resort to such help necessary, by refusing to concede a popular right proved to satiety, and demanded by eight-tenths of the people, and that after a rapid retrogression of commerce for seven years, which has ruined

tens of thousands of the people, and driven others to the gaol, the asylum, or to foreign shores. Women of England ! exigencies arose in the states of Sparta, Judea, and Rome, when public virtue turned its saddened eyes to your sex, which more than once saved the national fortunes from the factious folly of their husbands and lords. Your loftier religion, your gentler philanthropy, and your better knowledge, will all aid the succour which you may give in this crisis of the national sufferings to the Anti-Corn-Law League, which proposes to redeem the disheartened labourer from his serfdom to the monopolist, and to cast prodigal and supercilious aristocracy on its own resources.

The 'Quarterly Review' charges the whole animus of the League upon 'the unappeasable greediness of gain.' We do not deny that gain is one of the main motives in the agitation, but if *some* of the subscriptions have sprung from the reckonings of policy, it cannot surely be pretended that the '*unappeasable greediness of gain*' is the motive with the *millions* that oppose the Corn Laws. Ministers and churches innumerable, and distant from the seat of our manufactories, are equally emphatic in their opposition to these nefarious statutes. The influence of the prominent Leaguers, it is confessed, may be great in their localities ; but truly it cannot be the reason that there exists, in both Houses of Parliament, among a large proportion of the agriculturists, the shopkeepers in small towns, and the great capitalists in the metropolis, a strong sense of indignation against the existence of this capital monopoly. The love of gain must always be one of the primitive elements of political and commercial life ; since it is the main stimulant to enterprise, and the incentive to labour ; and, without it, the plough would be as motionless as the shuttle, and the wheels of Printing-house Square would be as still as those of the jenny. But with what audacity is this reproach cast upon the League ; for, what but the '*unappeasable greediness of gain*' at first originated, and now upholds the Corn Laws ? Is it pretended that these laws have been beneficial to a single class beside that of the landlords ? Are the poor better fed or clothed, better educated, or more protected in their civil rights since 1815 than they were before ? Are the shopkeepers deriving a better trade from the existence of the Corn Laws ? Nay, are the agriculturists themselves enriched by their operation ? Are not the labourers on the land quite as immoral, much less intelligent, and inconceivably worse fed and clothed than '*the serfs of the cotton lords*'? And, if it be alleged that prices have been maintained by the operation of these laws on all agricultural produce, how does the 'Quarterly Review' deal with the withering fact that the wages of praedial labour have been on the rapid subsidence, and are now at a disgraceful ratio beneath the lowest notions of remuneration ?

The 'Quarterly' labours earnestly to trace much of the power of the League to the 'Russell magistrates.' The Chartist Frost is compared with Sir J. Potter and others who are in the commission of the peace, but opposed to the Corn Laws. Lord Russell is soundly belaboured by the reviewer for having appointed none but opponents of the Corn Law to the commission of the peace; and yet, almost in the same page, he is taunted with being himself an advocate of the Corn Laws, and with having only at the eleventh hour resorted to the scheme of a fixed duty to keep his place! Passion is not only mad, but mendacious; and we need cite no other proof, and could cite no better, than 'the ephemeral spawn' of the reviewer himself. If Lord Russell and the Whig ministers were really the friends of the Corn Law, is it imaginable that they who have been repeatedly charged with the old sacerdotal sin of 'refusing even to open or shut the doors for naught,' should yet have chosen three-fourths of their magistrates from the advocates of the League, and particularly in the localities of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where such an election would be prejudicial to the Whig ministry in the highest degree. The reviewer calculates on the intellectual laziness of his readers, of which he has received for years both the profit and the proof. The Conservatives have been so accustomed to have all the officials of the kingdom bending one way

'their precious influence,'

that it is intolerable to see a few knights and justices of the peace, at last, among the friends of the people. Long-continued custom is generally, by shallow apologists of usage, easily confounded with right; and wills that have long been practised to command find it hard indeed to obey. The aristocracy who have monopolized every ray of power, have only had 'to speak and it was done'; and now that the lion of popular strength has roused himself, and roars, from his lair, warnings of resolute action, the asses that have pranced and yawned with toleration in his presence, affect indignation that he should disturb their pastimes. There are fictitious influences enough, we are aware, in the petty distinctions of life, to stagger the frail virtue of our nature; and if the maintenance of the Corn Laws had not been a grievance of the coarsest nature, the Sir Thomases, and Sir Ralphs, and the Aldermen of Stockport, Leeds, and Manchester, would have been quiet enough. The fact of their joining such a body as the League, which commits them to fellowship with men unknown to fortune and to fame, the churchman with the dissenter, the devout with the sceptic, and occasionally the tory with the radical, is proof enough that the cause of their union must be one of no ordinary grievance. Nothing less could have procured such a coalition of all tastes and parties, who have

little in common but their resolution to overthrow the Corn Laws—in which work, Providence, poverty, and time, those ancient allies of suffering virtue, are now in active co-operation. If, however, the League did not muster a knight, a peer, a magistrate, or an alderman, the Corn Laws must fall. Arrayed against them, in strong confederacy, are the 1,500,000 paupers, the loves and chat of women, the prayers of the devout, the power of the voluntary pulpit, and the nameless *et cetera* that start every day some new spring into the power of the League.

The attempt on the part of the reviewer to affix upon the magistrates of Manchester the odium of having coaxed the outbreak into being, and of having petted its countless hordes in their strange itinerations through the clothing districts, is worthy of his faction. Coercion of opinion as long as it will work, and criminal informations when it fails, are all the policy of which Conservative reviewers dream. Voluntary reform of abuses, and opportune concession of popular rights, are in its diction, ‘hypocritical cant and rabid faction.’ These ‘Russell magistrates’ reflected infinite honour on their commission of the peace, in having warned the government *publicly*, and not as spies, of a probable outbreak; and not the less so in throwing upon the government the responsibility of the *incentive* causes of the disturbance. The clerical creatures and squires that would have galloped at the head of Dragoons, with drawn sabres, among the multitude, slaughtering the innocent and hanging the leaders at the next lamp-post, would, we are aware, have better comported with the reviewer’s notions of a justice of the peace; and if ‘the Russell magistrates’ had played over again the scenes of Peterloo, and put themselves into valorous obsequience to Sir James Graham, the Horse Guards, and the commissioners of police, doubtless they would have figured in the ‘Quarterly Review’ as gentlemen of honourable sentiments.

Lord Brougham is one of that class of men, who, if true in the main to the cause of the people, would have escaped retaliation for a score of minor offences against prudence or taste; for his undoubted powers would have melted criticism into a mixture of admiration and lenity. His former services would have pleaded against rigorous exaction for present faults; and the hope that his Quixotism arose more from the frolic of genius than from a depravation of principle, would have stayed the *ultionis ictus*; and thus he might have masqueraded through the House of Peers, with the licence of the lord of misrule, if it had been felt that he remained the friend of the people, who could scarcely expect entire freedom from his scorpion tongue. Let jokes go free, by all means; and we shall always protest against the Lilliputs and the farthingalers becoming the appraisers of our great men.

But are Lord Brougham's sins against the cause of the people of the jest class? or are they the mere whimsicalities of a genius, wanton in the consciousness of its power to retrieve in an hour the sports of a week? No; his lordship's offences are of graver dye; for during nearly the whole of his time in the upper house, he has shamefully squandered the great influence with which he rose to the woolsack, and abused the confidence which the friends of the popular cause had fain reposed in Henry Brougham.

We do not assert that there is a compact between the ex-Chancellor and the friends of monopoly, that he should delude the popular advocates by occasional ardour in their cause. But if he had been hired to exert himself to the utmost on the side of the Tories, abating the formal renunciation of his former principles, he could not have done more than he has done to make himself neutral in the cause to which he owes much of his fortune and all his honours. His attacks on the League are as rancorous as those of Ferrand, though more oblique; but his lordship is deceived if he imagines the public are misled by his repudiation of some of its men, and his praise of others, and by his very occasional advocacy of the *abstract doctrines* of free trade. The Anti-Corn Law leaders have shown their sagacity in never reposing their confidence in Lord Brougham; and *we imagine that it is to this fact* all his chagrin is attributable. About four years ago, some persons connected with the League were desirous of making overtures to his lordship in a vote of thanks; this was very properly opposed; a slight skirmish ensued, which became public, and as the circumstance had evidently galled his lordship, he addressed an angry letter to the Leaguers, who, however, neither apologised nor relaxed their determination to keep clear of the quagmire on which the League would have stood if it had chosen Lord Brougham for its champion. There is, we also suspect, another ground of unconfessed grievance. The League has always reposed confidence in O'Connell, and has at all times received his honest support with gratitude; nor has it been niggard of its confidence and praise to 'the best abused man of his age,' and who, from intellectual, as well as other causes, is at heart hated by Lord Brougham. Some truths can never be proved, and yet no one feels the less confidence in their certainty; and this is one of the class. Lord Brougham's nature prepares him for the *omne aut nil*, and his history proves with what rigour he uses the maxim. The League did not consign its championship to a man who, by one speech as a friend, might have baffled the preparations of years, which, as an enemy, he would not have injured. As a secondary, this nobleman is stifled; for his volition becomes paralytic, even in the best of

causes, where his personal gratification is not made the *end*, and the public good the *pander* to the orator. Had the precious and perilous interests of this glorious agitation against the well-organized powers of monopoly been committed to a man whose intellect was liable to be driven from its course by a hundred gusts of passion, and whose heart has never shown its possession of the greater attributes of philanthropy, the friends of the people might long before this have had reason to reproach their own credulity, and to bewail the results of their misplaced confidence. We repeat *advisedly*, the League has not courted Lord Brougham; and it is to the faint praise with which they have responded to his occasional sallies against the monopolists, that his lordship's attack on the League, through Mr. Bayley, is mainly attributable.

To Lord Brougham's power, and his former services to the people, we have always paid willing homage; and would rather see him 'come to himself' than continue the discarded pantaloon of the aristocratic wardrobe. He can never attain to the confidence of the nobles, who plainly use him, as some have done O'Connor, to do the service which none but the scout can effect. At what time the name of Henry Brougham was quoted with admiration in every poor man's house, at the plough, in the tavern, and the school, by the oppressed colonist, the merchant at his counter, and by the weaver at his loom, did he 'lick the aristocratic hand that has purloined him from himself'? Would he in those days, 'in season and out of season,' have sprung to his feet to pour fulsome compliments on such weathered opponents of liberty as the Duke of Wellington? Would he then have lavished ever and anon paragraphs of gross adulation on such renegades as Lyndhurst and Graham; or have become the apologist of such men as Sir Robert Peel and Lord Wharncliffe? Would he have gone 'infinite leagues' out of his way to reach such men as Mr. Bayley, especially when he knew that his attack would only injure the cause of popular liberty? No; if there had been no other reasons for withholding praise from enemies, lest the accident of his generosity should by weak persons be mistaken for the major of his purpose, Lord Brougham, when he had his fortune and honours to acquire, had prudence sufficient to have been chary of his praise. But he has now acquired all that a subject can obtain, without losing the ambition to be chief; and perhaps destitute of the courage requisite for formal apostasy, or faintly restrained by the last abraded link of public virtue, with no chance of again becoming the popular champion, he has embraced the only distinction left, that of becoming marplot, which leaves him the liberty of both 'envying Judah and of vexing Israel'—an admirable position, if his lordship

be not covenanted to the Conservatives ! Bound by no principles, attached to no body of men, aiming at no public objects, how independent must he feel ! Irresponsible in his position, and unlimited in his licence of speech, he can now lampoon the virtuous, or satirize the sufferer, or do genuflexion to the oppressor without fear of the electors at York, or the results of the canvass. Has his lordship ever seriously turned his eyes upon himself within the last ten years ? When he does, we may assure him, that without one of Dee's stones he will see the indignant ghost of Henry Brougham sternly challenging the peer to

‘Look on this picture and on that,’

or perhaps more finely appealing to its lordly tenement,

‘Is this the region, this the clime?’ &c.

Lord Brougham is evidently ill at ease ; he has frolicked away the autumn of his life with the *Roebucks* and ‘ wild asses of the desert,’ till he is no longer taken for one of the lions ; his equals discard, his victims jeer him, and at his occasional roar the ass yaws, and the veriest curs bark disdain. Children play with the faint smoke, and mock the rumbling of the *spent* volcano.

But we must notice Lord Brougham’s attack on the Rev. Mr. Bayley, of Sheffield ; the more so, since, though that gentleman has fully explained his meaning in *quoting the anecdote* “of the hundred lots,” his lordship has recently had the unmanliness to add insult to outrage, by again talking of “the assassination speeches of a Yorkshire clergyman.” It is very remarkable, that no other parts of Mr. Bayley’s speeches have been charged with violence but his *narrative of the two anecdotes* ; and, with these exceptions, he certainly has not uttered anything approaching to the vehemence of many of the other speakers at the meetings of the League. Now, with all deference to some of our contemporaries, we cannot see why, *if such were* the state of feeling in any part of the country,—and no man knows better than Lord Brougham in what language famine, beggary, and pauperism express themselves,—where was the harm of quoting, *as an evidence* of the state of *a part* of the public feeling, words which the speaker had heard, and which, we are sure, are far from being confined to Yorkshire ? No one who knows Mr. Bayley could suspect him any more than Mr. Cobden of advocating that which, if advocated, however remotely, would lead to the dissolution of the social compact, and to the highest breach of the divine commands. Mr. Bayley is known to have been for several years the advocate of the doctrine, that it is unlawful to deprive men of life, even for the gravest of crimes. To suppose him, therefore, capable of advocating contrary doctrines against innocent men is perfectly absurd ; and the absurdity was only

exceeded by the wickedness of endeavouring to connect the relation of the anecdote with the crime of M'Naughten; with how much justice, the event of the trial has proved. If Lord Brougham had made an attack on Mr. Bayley fairly, *out of his place* in parliament, and given him a chance of appealing to a jury of his countrymen to adjudge the slanderer, it would have been more decent, if no less wicked. As it is, his lordship may thank himself for Mr. Bayley's letter to him. Long may he enjoy the honour of the *cognomen* which the indignant writer has fixed on his noble assailant!

We cannot conclude without expressing our heartfelt sorrow at the present position of the government and the people. We are now happily spared the trouble of proving the public distress. It is judged of all; the clodpoles have conned the lesson till they have it by rote, and their very kine low in tones of sympathy with the manufacturing towns. Yet what does the government propose as a remedy? Why, it proposes to mend the drainages, and to compel the people whom it has pauperised to keep their dung-heaps more neatly, and more scientifically to ventilate their pig-sty! This reminds us of a certain period in the history of Rome, when all classes appeared to be seized with a fervid desire for reform. The forum was crowded with zealots; the tablets were hung upon the walls, covered with notices of new laws; sumptuary laws were in preparation to restrain the number of peacocks that should be eaten, or to regulate when diamonds liquefied might be quaffed by favourite and dainty ladies; but after the inhabitants had enjoyed the delights of good purpose, the reforms dwindled into a slight improvement of the sewers near the Appian Way! When the people are in want of bread, Sir Robert Peel is projecting an improved method of keeping the manure! When the mills are silent, and the artisans are tramping the streets in wooden shoes, the only thing that the government appears to be earnest about is, 'the privileges of the House,' and a new method of providing for the superfluity of clergymen—by building more churches for some, and by thrusting others into superintendencies of parish and factory schools. The aristocracy have objected to the repeal of the Corn Laws, the peculiar burdens of the land! Mr. Ward brings in a motion to inquire into these peculiar burdens, and the House refuses the inquiry! The premier declares, that all people should buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, and yet the law that compels us to *buy* in the dearest and *sell* in the cheapest market he refuses to repeal! Is it wonderful that the aristocracy should be despised, and that Sir Robert Peel in particular should be the object of contempt? We confess it would be a miracle, indeed, if it were otherwise.

It is, no doubt, ‘the unappeasable greediness of gain’ alone that accounts for the reluctance of parliament to repeal, as it was from it that the Corn Laws were first imposed. How melancholy to the lover of his country must be the inference to which we are thus driven! This comes of the apathy with which the public have regarded the morals of government; which, even more than the taxes, ought to be most vigilantly observed. Instances of private persons sacrificing principle to lucre are to be expected, and, in one sense, may be easily pardoned; but the crime of avarice culminates only when the progress of legislation is made to wait upon Mammon. The avarice of governments has not the plea of necessity which individuals are wont to interpose. All governments can afford to practise the most abstract morality, and men will never be well governed till they look better to the morality of their rulers. Nay, if the repeal of the Corn Laws would be a certain national loss, still, as their existence is a violation of the plainest obligations of right, both human and divine, their repeal ought to be instantaneous and entire; and what was the nation’s loss could be easily borne.

Until the Corn Laws are repealed, however, the government—that cannot, if it dared, and dare not, if it could, suppress the League—must take all the consequences of the mighty agitation with which it fills the land. The wheel of the mill troubles the water vastly beyond the fall of its diameter; and as long as the wheel is in motion, nothing can prevent the surrounding agitation. The public grievances are all concatenated; and while the League is ceaselessly at work to destroy the master-link of monopoly’s chain, all the lesser parts must vibrate to the shock. Complete suffrage, annual parliaments, &c., receive no small collateral aid from the operations of the League, though it neither enforces these doctrines nor directly abets their disciples. But when the baffled people shall once arrive at the conviction that they will not get the instalment of the Corn Laws, they will simultaneously drop the demand, and require the whole debt from the men that have long mocked their arguments and jested with their tears.